This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

BV
741
.S94
W62

B 807,034

GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ARTES · SCIENTIA · VERITAS
1817

Vol. 3

A

REPLY

TO THE

REVIEW OF WHITMAN'S LETTERS TO PROFESSOR STUART,

IN THE

"SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS,"

FOR MARCH, 1831.

By BERNARD WHITMAN.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY GRAY AND BOWEN.

1831.

BV
741
.S94
W62

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1831, by Gray & Bowen, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

CAMBRIDGE: E. W. METCALF AND CO.

JAN 19 1945

LETTER I.

Reverend Sir,

I have read your Review of my Letters to Professor Stuart. You have noticed several verbal and unimportant errors, denied the truth of some of my statements, and advanced very little argument and evidence in support of your positions. In the estimation of candid and intelligent Christians, your Review only serves to confirm the accuracy of my descriptions, the correctness of my reasoning, and the soundness of my conclusions. But your pamphlet was probably designed to make the more ignorant portion of your own denomination believe, that my Letters are largely disfigured with inaccuracies and misrepresentations. As I originally wrote for the more special benefit of this class of the community, I am constrained by a sense of duty to appear again in their behalf. I wish now to convince them, *that all the essential statements in my Letters to Professor Stuart are substantially correct.* This is the principal object of the present publication.

In your Review, you have observed no order, connexion, or method. You have jumbled together the various topics of discussion, brought forward the same inaccuracies in several different parts of your book, and then, like a child, counted up your fingers to see how many apparent falsehoods you had discovered. I shall not attempt to follow your rambling course. I shall proceed in the same order in which the subjects are arranged in my Letters. Under each division, I shall inquire what you have done to weaken or destroy my conclusions. I shall cheerfully correct all mistakes and retract all misstatements; for I am anxious to defend nothing but the simple, unvarnished truth. I shall also advance evidence in support of those assertions, the truth of which you have denied; so that you may know what testimony has appeared satisfactory to my own mind. I shall likewise endeavour to answer your reasoning. This I shall do, to a considerable degree, in the words of distinguished orthodox divines; and more especially, in the words of the pious, venerated, and orthodox Richard Baxter.

MBL

I appeal to him more particularly at this time, because we are informed that he has of late become a great favorite with your party; and the Editor of the Recorder assures us, that his writings are read "*with affection and pleasure by orthodox Christians.*" I now ask you and the public to accompany me in my examination of your Review.

I. Use made of Human Creeds.

You have contradicted several of my statements under this division. Some of your assertions are made in direct opposition to satisfactory evidence; others relate to verbal and unimportant mistakes, which I cheerfully correct; others again are mere quibbles about words, and but three are deserving the least notice.

1. Speaking of the Andover creed, I made this declaration: "Scarcely an article of the whole can be expressed in Scriptural language." In proof of my assertion, I presented the creed to my readers, and left them to decide for themselves concerning the truth of my position. Your whole answer to this statement is contained in the following sentence. "The *sense* of many of these articles, not to say the most of them, *can* be expressed in Scriptural language." Let me entreat you to peruse the following extract from the pious Baxter.

"Some must have confessions in words of their own, to which all that will be accounted Christians must subscribe; or at least all that would have communion with them. Though we would subscribe to the *whole Scripture*, or any confession drawn up in its phrase and matter, yet this will not serve for union and communion. They tell us, heretics will subscribe to the Scripture; and I tell them, that heretics may subscribe also to their confessions, and force a sense of their own upon them; and that God never left them to make better confessions, and fitter to discover heresies, than Scripture doth afford. — And thus men lose themselves, and abuse the church, because God's word will not serve their turn as a rule for us to unite upon. This is the *One Rule* that God hath left, and men must needs blame this as insufficient, and mend God's word by the devices of their addle brains, and then complain of divisions when they have made them. The rule that all must agree in, must be made by *One* that is above *all*, and whose authority is acknowledged by all. Never will the church have full unity till the Scripture sufficiency be acknowledged. You complain of many opinions and ways, and many you will still have, till the *One Rule*, the Scripture, be the standard of our religion. Stick to this one Bible, and let nothing come into your faith or religion but what comes thence, and when controversies arise, try them by this; and if you cannot do it yourselves, then take up the help of ministers or synods, and use them not as masters, but as helpers of your faith; not to make you *another rule*, but to help you understand this *One Rule*, and thus you may come to be of one religion, and never otherwise." — *Practical Works*. fol. Vol. IV. p. 673. *Letters*, p. 6. *Review*, p. 45.

2. Speaking of the Lord's Supper, I asked, by what authority you made subscription to human creeds the condition of church membership? You answer my inquiry with some weak and sophistical reasoning. Sir, this is not a question for "carnal reason" to decide. I admit that you have a perfect right to make as many creeds as you please for your own use. You may fill your house with them, and every morning and evening swear fidelity to their misty terms, and thus proclaim to the world that you have determined to be no wiser on religious subjects to-morrow than you have been to-day. But you have no right to make a creed for another person, or a Christian church. One of two things must be true; either Jesus Christ is the head of the church, or he is not. If you say he is not the head, please to inform me whom he has commissioned to execute this office. If you say he is the head, please to show me the passages in which he has given you liberty to place a human creed before his Table, and exclude from his feast all who will not bow to your idol. I boldly assert, that you can produce no such text from the Scriptures, and consequently I must believe that your authority is usurped. I shall not notice your attempt to show that it is proper to excommunicate from your churches those who renounce their belief in your human confessions; for until you can show your commission from Christ to make your interpretations of Scripture terms of Christian communion, you certainly cannot prove that you have any right to exclude those who renounce those human conditions of church membership. But since you incline to reason on this question, I present you the following arguments from the orthodox Baxter.

"*Addition* to Christ's terms are very perilous, as well as *diminution*, when men will deny either church entrance or communion to any that Christ would have received, because they come not up to certain terms which they, or such as they, desire. And though they think that Christ giveth them power to do this, or that reason or necessity justifieth them, their error will not make them guiltless. Imputing their error unto Christ untruly, is no small aggravation of the sin. — Nor is it a small fault to usurp a power proper to Christ; to make themselves lawgivers to his church without any authority given by him; their ministry is another work. — And it is dangerous pride to think themselves great enough, wise enough, and good enough, to come after Christ, and to amend his work, and do it better than he hath done.— Much less when they hereby imply an accusation against him and his institutions, as if he had not done it well, but they must amend it, or all will be intolerable. — And the merciful Lord and Saviour of the church, that came to take off heavy burdens and intolerable yokes, will not take it well to have men come after him, and as by his authority, to make his easy yoke more strict, and his light burden more heavy, and to cast or keep out those that he hath redeemed, and doth re-

ceive, and to deal cruelly with those that he hath so dearly bought, and tenderly loveth. — And indeed it is oftener for men's own interest and dominion, to keep up their power and honor of superiority, that men thus use the servants of Christ, than truly to keep clear the church, and keep out the polluters." Vol. IV. p. 653.

3. Speaking of creeds, I asserted that the leaders of the orthodox denomination made a human confession, and not the Bible, their standard of religious truth. In proof of this assertion, I presented a great mass of evidence, a multitude of undeniable facts. You deny the truth of my charge, and offer a few words of explanation. All you say on the subject amounts to nothing more than this; that no orthodox Christian *means* to make the human creed the infallible standard. So it might be said, that the persecuting, conscientious Paul did not *mean* to do any thing contrary to the will of God. I shall not, therefore, reason about your motives. I will merely present you some extracts from the orthodox Dr. Stiles, former President of Yale College, which are peculiarly applicable to this question. These are his precious words.

"It is indeed a little unhappy, that like others in the Christian world, *some of us* are fond of substituting human interpretations given by authority of councils and learned men, exacting that the sacred Scriptures be understood according to senses fitted and defined in human tests, which all acknowledge to be fallible. But it is to be hoped, that we shall stand fast in the liberty wherewith the gospel has made us free. There ought to be no restrictions on the conscience of an honest and sober believer of revelation. The right of conscience and private judgment is unalienable. And it is truly the interest of all mankind to unite themselves into one body, for the liberty, free exercise, and unmolested enjoyment of this right, especially in religion. Not all the difference of sentiment, not all the erroneous opinions that have yet been started, afford just umbrage for its extinction, abridgment, or embarrassment. Have the Protestant formularies subserved the defence of the truth as it is in Jesus? Rather, have they not in event proved new sources of religious dispute and undeterminable controversy? The churches of Geneva have long since had the wisdom to drop this article of *consensus*, as the great disturbance of the Christian harmony. And the clergy have found themselves obliged to interpret the Helvetic, and all other Protestant confessions, in the Scripture sense, with a *Divinis veritatibus in hoc libro contentis subscribo.* I am satisfied we shall err less if we make the Scriptures the only rule of faith, than if we depart from this, and substitute another; or as many do, who say they believe the Scriptures the *only* rule, and yet in all their judgments on Scripture, measure that *only* rule by *another* rule. Nor do substituted rules answer the purpose of detecting heretics at all better than the primary rule, since on ex-

perience it is found none more freely subscribe and swear to human tests than deists, skeptics, and the most debauched. If God's inclosure will not keep out the erroneous, can it be expected that ours will? The universal pretext is a preservation against heresy. But it is to be remarked, that human tests make more heretics than the word of God; all that one determines to be heresy, is not heresy by the Scriptures. A man may be a very great heretic according to the one, and an excellent Christian according to the other, at the same time. St. Paul was one of the greatest heretics, and even gloried in his heresy, and yet was one of the best of Christians."—*Convention Sermon*, pp. 35, 36.

And now, Sir, what have you done under this section to weaken or destroy my logical conclusions? I will conclude my remarks under this head, with some extracts in relation to the origin and injury of human creeds from the pious and orthodox Richard Baxter. He probably understood this subject as well, or better than any other man. He assures us that creeds originated with the Devil, that they are his engine for the destruction of religion, and have made all the divisions in the church. I hope the following most important sentiments will be read not only with *satisfaction* and *pleasure*, but with such *practical self-improvement*, as to induce all to renounce the devil and *all* his works. Here you have his most valuable thoughts.

"The Lord Jesus, in wisdom and tender mercy, established a law of grace, and rule of life, pure and perfect, but simple and plain; laying the condition of man's salvation more in the honesty of the believing heart, than in the strength of wit, and subtilty of a knowing head. He comprised the truths which were of necessity to salvation in a narrow room; so that the Christian faith was a matter of great plainness and simplicity. As long as Christians were such and held to this, the gospel rode in triumph through the world, and an omnipotency of the Spirit accompanied it, bearing down all before it. The SERPENT, envying this happiness of the church, hath no way to undo us, but by drawing us from our Christian simplicity. By the occasion of heretics' quarrels and errors, the Serpent steps in, and will needs be a Spirit of zeal in the church; and he will so overdo against heretics, that he persuades them they must enlarge their *creed*, and add this clause against one, and that against another, and all was but for the perfecting and preserving of the Christian faith. And so he brings it to be a matter of so much wit to be a Christian, as Erasmus complains, that ordinary heads were not able to reach it. He hath got them, with a religious zealous cruelty to their own and others' souls, to lay all their salvation, and the peace of the church, upon some unsearchable mysteries about the Trinity, which God either never revealed, or never clearly revealed, or never laid so great stress upon; yet he persuades them, that there was Scripture proof enough for these; only

the Scripture spoke it but in promises, or in darker terms, and they must but gather into their creed the consequences, and put it into plainer expressions, which heretics might not so easily corrupt, pervert, or evade. Was not this reverend zeal? And was not the Devil seemingly now a Christian of the most judicious and forward sort? But what got he at this one game?

"1. He necessitated implicit faith even in fundamentals, when he had got points beyond a vulgar reach among fundamentals. 2. He necessitated some living judge for the determining of fundamentals—that is, what it is in sense that the people must take for fundamentals. 3. He got a standing verdict against the perfection and sufficiency of Scripture, and consequently against Christ, his Spirit, his Apostles, and the Christian faith; that it will not afford us so much as a creed or system of fundamentals, or points absolutely necessary to salvation and brotherly communion, in fit or tolerable phrases, but we must mend the language at least. 4. He opened a gap for human additions, at which he might afterwards bring in more at his pleasure. 5. He framed an engine for an infallible division, and to tear in pieces the church, casting out all as heretics that would not subscribe to his additions, and necessitating separation by all dissenters, to the world's end, till the Devil's engine be overthrown. 6. And hereby he lays a ground upon the division of Christians, to bring men into doubt of all religion, as not knowing which is right. 7. And he lays the ground of certain heart-burnings, and mutual hatred, contentions, revilings, and enmity. Is not here enough got at one cast? Did not the Devil get more in his gown in a day, than he could get by his sword in three hundred years?

"This plot the Serpent hath found so successful, that he hath followed it on to this day. Yea, and where modesty restrains men from putting all such inventions and explications in their creed, the Devil persuades men, that, they being the judgments of godly reverend divines, it is almost as much as if it were in the creed; and therefore whoever dissenteth must be noted with a black coal, and you must disgrace him, and avoid communion with him as an heretic. Hence lately is your union, communion, and the churches' peace, laid upon certain unsearchable mysteries about predestination, the order and objects of God's decrees, the manner of the Spirit's secretest operations on the soul, the nature of the will's essential liberty, and its power of self-determining the divine concourse, determination, or predestination of man's and all other creatures' actions, that he is scarcely to be accounted a fit member for our fraternal communion that differs from us herein. Had it not been for this one plot, the Christian faith had been kept pure; religion had been one; the church had been one; and the hearts of Christians had been more one than they are. Had not the Devil turned orthodox, he had not made so many true Christians

heretics, as Epiphanius and Austin have enrolled in the black list. Had not the enemy of truth and peace got into the chair, and made so pathetic an oration as to influence the minds of the lovers of truth to be over zealous for it, and to do too much, we might have had truth and peace to this day. Yea, still, if he see any man of experience and moderation stand up to reduce men to the ancient simplicity, he presently seems the most zealous for Christ, and tells the unexperienced leaders of the flocks, that it is in favor of some heresy that such a [man] speaks;—he is tainted with Popery, or Socinianism, or Arminianism, or Calvinism, or whatsoever may make him odious with those he speaks to. O what the Devil hath got by over-doing!" Vol. II. pp. 896, 897.

Thus far the pious and orthodox Richard Baxter. Perhaps your leaders may feel convinced, while perusing these extracts, that they have not yet reached the "Saint's Everlasting Rest."

II. Ministerial Intercourse.

Five of your attacks upon my statements under this division require notice.

1. *The Rev. Ebenezer Hubbard.* You have made a most desperate attempt to invalidate my positions concerning your cruel and unhallowed persecutions of this gentleman. Your success has not been commensurate with your exertions. Your defeat must therefore be humbling; for, in this case, truth will have a most glorious triumph. As you have thrown out weighty charges against Mr. Hubbard, and accused him of furnishing me with the documents in this affair, I feel it my duty to clear him from such unjust suspicions. The facts are briefly these. I had heard, as well as many others in this region, of the efforts which had been made by orthodox leaders to ruin his character and prospects. A letter was addressed to him, requesting accurate information on the subject. He returned an answer, and stated explicitly, that if any one wished to become acquainted with the whole truth, he must visit Lunenburg, and converse with the leading people of his society; for he was not disposed to participate in the business. An individual went, at my expense, and at length obtained from Mr. Hubbard the original confessions, and the minutes which he had taken after his interviews with Payson and Braman. At these interviews a witness was always present, because Mr. Hubbard expected to refer the case to the civil court. From the information obtained in that region, and from these several documents, I made out the notice which was published. So that if there is any blame on this account, it rests wholly on my shoulders. I am now prepared to substantiate every important fact in my statement. I asserted that Payson went into Lunenburg, communicated the misrepresentations to an influential family, requested them to put them in circulation, and conceal the name of their in-

former. In proof of this assertion, I present you the following certificate.

"*Lunenburg, March* 23, 1831.

"This may certify, that when Rev. Mr. Payson of Leominster visited my house, to give information against the character of Rev. Mr. Hubbard of this town, Mr. Payson stated to me and my wife, that Mr. Hubbard was free in his exchanges with unitarians. I answered, 'We can put up with that, because it is better to be so, than not to have an orthodox minister settled over us.' Mr. Payson further stated, that Mr. Hubbard's character was bad, that he allowed his children to swear, and that if he was settled here, he would prove a curse to us. My wife asked, 'What is that you say?' and he answered, 'He will prove a curse to you.' He then said, 'If you will inquire of Mr. Putnam of Fitchburg, and Mr. Fisher of Harvard, and of a minister in Middleton, you will find Mr. Hubbard to be a bad man.' He then told us we must make all this public, and tell it to Deacon Sanderson, and, I think he said, Mr. Lawrence; saying to us, 'You have but a short time to do this in,' and that we must vote against his settlement here. He likewise said, 'This is enough against him, that Mr. Damon recommended him.' I told him, that I did not like to do this, for we had been striving to get an orthodox minister, and some had thought hard of us, and I did not know what they would think, if I went and told these things. Mr. Payson then said, 'Blessed are you who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for great is your reward in heaven.' He went on to say, 'As now you *know* these things, it is your *duty* to make them known.' I further declare, that when Mr. Payson was about to leave my house, I said to him, 'The account you give of Mr. Hubbard is very different from what a man gave me, a few weeks ago, who wished me to subscribe for the "National Preacher." *He* said Mr. Hubbard's character stood fair among the people with whom he lived.' Mr. Payson replied, 'You must tell what I have told you, but do not give my name.'

EDMUND PROCTOR."

I also stated that Mr. Payson was asked before witnesses, if he should have taken such a step, had not Mr. Hubbard exchanged with unitarians; and that he answered, "No." I also asserted, that Mr. Payson *intimated* that Mr. Putnam of Fitchburg and Mr. Fisher of Harvard, in connexion with himself, had taken Lunenburg under their special protection. The truth of both of these assertions you deny outright. In proof of my statements, I present you the following certificates. I could also give you the same account from Mr. Hubbard's minute of the conversation.

"*Lunenburg, March* 23, 1831.

"This may certify, that very soon after Mr. Payson's visit at my house, I visited Mr. Payson with Mr. Hubbard, and heard all their conversation; and that Mr. Hubbard began by asking Mr. Payson

'what could have induced him to come into Lunenburg to injure his character, as he had done.' Mr. Payson said, 'WE heard that you was likely to be settled in Lunenburg, and *Mr. Putnam* and *Mr. Fisher* and *myself* were at Andover, and inquired out your character, and found it was bad.' Mr. Hubbard said, 'he thought a man could be orthodox, and yet exchange with some unitarians.' Mr. Payson answered, 'WE *are determined to put down all who exchange with unitarians*, for we think they are as bad as unitarians.' Mr. Hubbard then said to Mr. Payson, '*Should you have come into Lunenburg to injure my character, if you had not heard that I exchanged with unitarians?*' and Mr. Payson said, 'No.' Mr. Hubbard said, 'The people in Lunenburg can take care of themselves, and I think your interference improper.' Mr. Payson said, 'WE *think it our duty to take care of Lunenburg*,' or words to that amount. EDMUND PROCTOR."

"The account given in this certificate of the interview between Rev. Mr. Payson, Mr. Edmund Proctor, and myself, which took place at the residence of Mr. Payson, is, I believe, strictly true.

EBENEZER HUBBARD."

Thus you see, that the moving cause of all Payson's exertions, was the exchanging with unitarians; for he expressly declared, that he and his ministerial brethren had determined to "*put down* all who exchange with unitarians." Mr. Hubbard also visited Mr Payson in company with Dr. Lawrence, an orthodox man, and now member of the church in Hollis. I give you an account of this interview from Mr. Hubbard's minutes, taken on his return to his own residence.

"Visited Rev. Mr. Payson of Leominster with Doct. Luke Lawrence of this town. I made to Mr. Payson a proposition, to let him pass unharmed, if he would give me the name of his informer. He answered, that he had promised not to do it, and that Mr. Proctor had made *him* the same promise, with respect to the concealment of *his* name; and that Mr. Proctor was not a man of his word, because he had given up *his* name. He said, that a minister was a public character, and that he had a right to talk about me; that he was told in Andover, that I would not consent to have Andover students come into Middleton and preach to my people; that I exchanged freely with unitarians; that I had no Sabbath school, or Bible class, or lectures, excepting the customary lecture before Communion; and that Mrs. Adams, a godly woman, wished to have Andover students preach in Middleton, but I would not consent. When I informed him that these were untruths, he answered 'That is your word for it, and I don't know that you tell the truth.' He then said, he thought a large number of the church-members in Lunenburg were destitute of vital or real religion, and that if I was settled there, I ought to discipline them, to ascertain whether they were orthodox. I then asked him, 'What is orthodoxy?' He said, 'The Andover creed, that is orthodoxy,'

and that they believed Calvin's doctrine of election, that a certain number of persons were decreed to be saved, and a certain number left to perish as a punishment for their sins. Dr. Lawrence then asked him, whether he did not think it better to have a minister exchange with a few unitarians, and so keep his town united, as Mr. Howe of Pepperell did, than to have it divided as Groton was. He answered, 'No.' Dr. Lawrence then observed, that he was well acquainted with Mr. Howe, and thought him a good man. Mr. Payson replied, that he did not think him so good a man as Mr. Todd of Groton. Dr. Lawrence then said, '*Do you doubt Mr. Howe's piety?*' and he answered, '*I do; and we, his orthodox brethren in the Association, are running upon Mr. Howe, and we will run upon him, till we run him down, for exchanging with unitarians.*' I then observed to him, that the calumnies he had circulated against me and my family were violations of the law. He answered, 'I did it *conscientiously.*' I asked him, if the account he gave Mr. Proctor of me and my family was the same that he received from his informer, and he said, 'Yes'; and also said, that Mr. Putnam gave the same account to Deacon Sanderson of Lunenburg, the day after I first visited him. I told him that this was not the case; that Mr. Putnam had said nothing against my character to Deacon Sanderson. I told him I would certainly commence a legal prosecution against him, unless he gave me the name of his informer. He said he would consider whether he ought to do this, and let me know week after next. I advised him to consult some lawyer. EBENEZER HUBBARD."

"*Lunenburg*, 1 *Nov.* 1831."

"*Hollis, April* 20, 1831.

"I, having read Rev. Mr. Hubbard's account of his interview with Rev. Mr. Payson of Leominster on Nov. 1, 1828, at which I was present, do now declare, that, to the best of my recollection, the said account is substantially correct. LUKE LAWRENCE."

I stated that orthodox ministers in the vicinity of Lunenburg went to Andover, and earnestly solicited information derogatory to the character of Mr. Hubbard. You pronounce this statement false. In proof of its truth, I present you the following account of Mr. Hubbard's interview with Braman.

"I visited Rev. Mr. Braman of Danvers on the 23d of December, in company with David Parker, jun. of North Reading. I stated to Mr. Braman, that I had seen a letter written by him to Mr. Payson of Leominster; that there had been a number of reports in circulation, which went to destroy my moral character, and that Mr. Payson, after relating them to respectable people in Lunenburg, had referred me to him as his authority. I then read the certificate of Edward and Elizabeth Proctor, and observed to Mr. Braman, that these were the reports. He answered, 'Does Mr. Payson say that I told him these things?' I answered 'He has referred me to you as his author.'

'And what,' said he, 'are you going to do?' I said, 'My own character and my duty to my family oblige me to resort to a legal prosecution against you, unless you can refer me to some individual, as your informer. What,' said I, 'could have induced you, who have been in habits of intimacy with me, and of ministerial intercourse, to pursue me to Lunenburg, with a design to injure my character?' He answered, 'I saw them at Andover, and they inquired about you, and *I told them I knew nothing personally against your character.* They then inquired, *if I had never heard any thing*, and I was unwilling to answer; *but they were so earnest*, that I told them what I had heard. But I did not think it would have come to this.' Mr. Braman appeared to be much alarmed, and I told him, I would not prosecute him, if he would give me the name of his informer. He then acknowledged that he heard what he related from *Washington Berry* of Middleton. I then earnestly requested him to go immediately with me to Middleton, and inquire into the truth of the reports, of the people there, whom he knew to be respectable. This he declined. I then told him that he might give me such a certificate as he thought proper; he accordingly wrote and signed, in presence of a witness, the following certificate. EBENEZER HUBBARD."

"This certificate certifies that some time in September last, I made statements to Rev. Mr. Payson of Leominster, respecting Mr. Hubbard's conduct in Middleton, which I have reason to believe were not exactly agreeable to truth. I did not state to any person that Rev. Mr. Hubbard brought up his children to use profane language, and Mr. Payson must have misapprehended me, if he says that I used such language; nor do I know that Rev. Mr. Hubbard allows of any such conduct in his family. And I hereby state that I know nothing personally against the Rev. Mr. Hubbard's moral character.

Signed in my presence. MILTON P. BRAMAN."

DAVID PARKER, Jun.

Danvers, December 23, 1828."

This statement proves, that Mr. Braman was *earnestly* beset for information derogatory to the character of Mr. Hubbard; and that Mr. Braman related what he heard with great reluctance. This reluctance is more fully expressed in a letter of Mr. Braman's to Mr. Hubbard, which I have before me.

But Mr. Braman contends, that the confession was extorted from Washington Berry. Here you have his own account of the affair.

"The confession of the gentleman in Middleton was an *extorted* one. He, at that time, was in ill health, suffering under a disorder of the nervous system, and liable in consequence to great mental agitation. Being severely threatened, and treated in an overbearing manner, by Mr. H.; being taken into a room with several individuals, all Mr. H.'s friends; being pressed with the consequences of refusing to sign the

confession *prepared for him*, and with no one to advise and assist him,—he put his name to a paper, the contents of which he had not presence of mind enough fully to comprehend. What deserves particular mention is, that his agitation and confession were principally produced and wrung from him, by an unfounded statement which Mr. H. made to him of some declarations I had reported him to have uttered respecting Mr. H.'s moral character. He doubted the truth of what Mr. H. said he could substantiate by witness, and asked for *one hour* to send for me, with a view to ascertain the correctness of the statement; but was told that it *could not be granted*, and that unless he should sign the confession speedily, a legal prosecution would be commenced against him. Fearing that, in case the matter should be brought to such a result, I might appear as an important witness against him, he reluctantly complied with the demand. Had I been sent for, his confession would have appeared in a very different shape from that in which it is presented in Mr. Whitman's Letters. As it now stands, *it ought never to have been demanded or made.*"

The following statement of Mr. Hubbard, corroborated by proper testimony, proves the incorrectness of several of these assertions.

"I was in Middleton, April 23, 1829, at the house of Mr. Andrew Merriam, and *early in the afternoon* of that day, sent a note to *Washington Berry*, a copy of which I have in the hand-writing of Miss Catharine Merriam, a member of the church in that place. In this note I stated, that I should be at the house of Mr. Andrew Merriam, until nine o'clock on the morrow morning, and that he might then settle with me if he chose; but if he did not, on my return to Lunenburg, I must pursue the course of the law. He returned a verbal answer by the messenger, that he would come at or near the appointed time. He brought with him two gentlemen, one of whom was his own cousin. These were men of his own choosing, and of course must have been considered by him as his friends. The Merriam family were all orthodox in their religious opinions, and were connected by marriage with the family of *Washington Berry;* and the two families had been on terms of great intimacy all the time of my ministry there. Mr. Berry and his two friends were introduced into the room by a member of the family, and some one or more of the family were present, I think, during most of the transaction. The object of the meeting was discussed. *Mr. Berry* said that Mr. Braman told him, that he would not testify, that he (Berry) had told him my moral character was bad. I told Berry that he had said this before a witness, and then observed, that if Mr. Braman would not testify to this, I had something from another source which was full to the purpose. I then read to him a note in the handwriting of Col. J. Putnam of Danvers, which was as follows: 'This may certify, that I heard Mr. Washington Berry say, that Rev. Mr. Hubbard allowed his children to swear as much as they had a mind to,

and did not try to hinder them; and he further said, that he believed Mr. Hubbard was a bad man, or words to that effect.' A confession was then written for Mr. Berry and read to him. He objected to it. It was altered once and again, till he ceased to object. It was then rewritten by me in its new form, and read to him; he read it also himself, and handed it to his two witnesses, who observed that they thought it would do. An hour's delay was then requested to send for Mr. Braman; to which I objected, on account of my desire to leave Middleton as soon as possible, and because he knew of the whole business before, and had had sufficient time, from the date of my note till the next morning, to send for Braman; and because if Braman should deny, Col. Putnam's certificate was sufficient; and because I could obtain more like evidence from other persons. After I read the certificate of Col. Putnam, Berry seemed to be alarmed and agitated. The fear that Mr. Braman would appear against him, could not have created this alarm; for Berry had declared at the time, that Mr. Braman had told him, that he would not testify that he (Berry) had called my moral character bad. Confident as was Berry of this, what ground had he for fear from this quarter? He could not suppose that I should change the determination of Braman; nor had *Berry* any reason to think, that Braman's testimony, in a court of law, would be against him. What becomes then of Braman's declaration in the Review, with respect to the *wringing* process? Berry, agitated as he is represented, had presence of mind enough to solicit of me, immediately after signing his confession, a certificate that I would not prosecute for the affair, and I gave him one to this effect, of which I have a copy. Disordered as his nervous system is represented to have been, I was told, that he had taken an active part in religious meetings, at or near the time of my visit to Middleton. That Mr. Braman and Mr. Berry were both in *fear* of a legal prosecution I have no doubt. It was Col. Putnam's certificate that satisfied Berry he could make no further excuse. I demanded of him no more than reasonable satisfaction, and the presence of twenty such men as the Rev. Mr. Braman would not have induced me to relax in my demand.

EBENEZER HUBBARD."

Now what becomes of Braman's account of the *extorted* confession? I am very sorry that Christians should be found in such inextricable difficulties. Comments are unnecessary. But to make the whole affair still plainer, and my case still stronger, I will give you another extract from a statement of the Rev. Mr. Hubbard.

"I wrote a letter to Mr. Braman, dated January 26, 1829, and stated what Mr. Payson had done, and observed that the gentlemen in Middleton, with whom originated the calumnies, must give me redress or suffer the penalty of the law. I would here observe, that as yet I had had no communication with *Berry* on this subject. I also earnestly

requested Mr. Braman to visit Middleton, and inquire of respectable people into my character, and to ascertain what confidence ought to be placed in the reports against me, and observed that if he would do this, I trusted he might be able to send me a more ample testimony of my innocence than he had given in his certificate of Dec. 23, 1828. He wrote to me soon after, and sent me the certificate, which expressed the earnestness with which he was pressed for information about me at Andover, and also his full belief of the falsehood of the reports, and his sorrow that he had been the instrument of their circulation. In my letter, I complained to him of his too hasty confidence in *Berry*. In his answer he states a number of reasons, why he thought he ought to place such confidence in him; such as that he thought him a friend of religion, and that he was employed to board the ministers who preached in Middleton; and then observed, that *Berry* was desirous to settle with me, and that he had no doubt I could settle to my satisfaction and the satisfaction of my people.

"It appears, then, that Mr. Braman had not only referred me to Mr. Berry as his informer, when I visited him on December 23, 1828, but had also acknowledged the same in a letter to me, by giving reasons for his confidence in him, and asserting that Berry was desirous to settle with me. Now, why these declarations of Braman in the Review, if *Berry* had told him nothing against my moral character? Will Mr. Braman pretend, that the reports did not affect my moral character? What does he say in the published confession? What then is his declaration to the Reviewer, but a play upon words? According to his letter, and confession, and previous declaration to me, those reports were certainly considered by him, as injurious to my moral character. What he asserts then in his letter to the Reviewer, and what he calls an unfounded statement, is simply this; that he never told me, that Berry had said any thing to him against my moral character. Previous to my settlement with *Berry*, the gentleman of North Reading, who visited Braman with me, informed me, that Braman had visited him to obtain his testimony, that he (Braman) never told me, in his presence, that Berry told him (Braman) that my moral character was bad; and he declared to Braman that he could give no such testimony. This is the witness of whom Braman speaks in his communication to the Reviewer. I perfectly remember the declaration of Braman to me at our first interview. After he had referred me to Mr. Berry as his informer, while we were both standing near to each other before the fire, I asked him this question, 'Did the stories you heard from Mr. Berry lead you to think that my moral character was bad?' 'Yes,' was his answer. EBENEZER HUBBARD."

In confirmation of Mr. Hubbard's statements, I present you with the following certificates from three of the most respectable gentlemen in Middleton. I would here observe, that most of my certificates in

this whole business are from orthodox individuals, and all of them from persons of the first respectability.

"This certifies that we were present at an interview between Mr. Washington Berry of Middleton and Rev. E. Hubbard of Lunenburg, one of us at the request of Mr. Berry, and the other at the request of Mr. Hubbard and of Mr. Berry, some time in April, 1829; and that we recollect that, when a paper was presented to said Berry, with the remark from Mr. Hubbard, that if he would sign *that*, their difficulties would be settled; Mr. Berry answered that he could not sign it, because it stated that he had spoken to Mr. Braman against Mr. Hubbard's character, which he had not done, and requested an hour to send for Mr. Braman. Mr. Hubbard objected to the delay because he was in haste to return home, and that now was the time to settle it. Afterward a certificate of Col. Jesse Putnam was read by Mr. Hubbard, and was handed to said Berry, and we do not recollect that he objected to it. This certificate stated that Mr. Berry had spoken against Mr. Hubbard's character in allowing his children to swear, and not hindering them. The aforesaid paper or confession was then altered by said Hubbard till said Berry no longer objected; and then Mr. Hubbard said to Mr. Berry, that, 'he did not wish him to sign it unless he could do it *conscientiously*,' or what amounted to this. Mr. Berry then signed it and we attested it. We do not recollect that any severity or harshness of language or manner was exhibited on either side. We thought that Mr. Berry was agitated at the time; what was the cause we knew not, unless it was the fear of a legal prosecution. We further recollect that Mr. Berry invited us to go with him to hear what was said and for no other purpose. This account is, according to the best of our recollection, the truth. EPHRAIM FULLER.

"*Middleton, April* 27, 1831. AMOS BATCHELDER."

"This certifies that I was present a small part of the time of the interview between Mr. Washington Berry and Rev. Mr. Hubbard, an account of which is given in a certificate signed by Col. Amos Batchelder and Mr. Ephraim Fuller, both of this town, which certificate I have read, and that, as far as I can now recollect, what is stated in said certificate with respect to Mr. Hubbard's reading a paper or confession to Mr. Berry, and Mr. Berry's objecting to it, and wishing to send and get up Mr. Braman, and Mr. Hubbard's objecting to this wish of Mr. Berry on account of his hurry to return home, is substantially true. I also say that to the best of my recollection I understood said Berry to say, that he had not injured said Hubbard's moral character that he knew of. I also say, that, to the best of my recollection, what Mr. Hubbard said to Mr. Berry with respect to his signing said confession, if he could not do it conscientiously, as this is stated in the said certificate of said Fuller and Batchelder, is also true. I also thought that Mr. Berry

was agitated at the time; from what cause I know not, unless it was the fear of a legal prosecution. ANDREW MERRIAM.

"*Middleton, April* 28, 1831."

"This certifies that at the request of Rev. Ebenezer Hubbard, and Col. Amos Batchelder and Mr. Ephraim Fuller, who were the two witnesses to Washington Berry's confession to said Hubbard, I went to Mr. Washington Berry this day and expressed a wish that he would attend a meeting between the abovementioned persons for the purpose of giving a true statement with respect to what took place at the time when said Berry made his confession to said Hubbard, and that said Berry declined going. DAVID S. WILKINS.

"*Middleton, April* 27, 1831."

I think you must now be satisfied that Braman's statement is altogether incorrect. I would merely communicate a very curious item of intelligence in connexion with this affair. Soon after Berry's confession was given, a list of certificates nearly one yard in length was obtained, from his brother, Mr. Braman, and other orthodox ministers, declaring that they had never heard Berry charge Mr. Hubbard with immorality. This curious document was carried into Lunenburg by Mr. Payson, and left with an individual for exhibition. It has lately been brought to light, and serves to disclose the iniquity of the principal actors in this scene of persecution. I forbear to dwell upon the various disclosures that have been made to me during my investigation of this business.

Now let us attend to Mr. Putnam's account of Mr. Payson's confession. He asserts, that "it was on the ground of this evidence, and *this alone*, and not by the 'terrors of the civil law,' that Mr. Payson expressed his belief that these statements were incorrect." He also states that "the very object of this part of the paper" (the italicized words in Payson's confession) "was to show that Mr. Payson's statements had been greatly magnified; and that reports had been circulated very different from what he stated. From some cause or other, Mr. Hubbard objected to this form, and would not be satisfied without the additional words, which, in the original draft, are interlined after the word *me*, viz. 'from misapprehension or any other cause, though I would not implicate any one individual.'" Both of these statements are proved incorrect by the following certificates.

"I hereby certify, that some time before Mr. Payson made his confession to Mr. Hubbard, he came to my house, and asked my wife, if she knew the consequence of an oath. She answered, 'I hope I am not ignorant of that; and I am sure I reported nothing but what I heard you say.' Mr. Payson then said, 'You was not in the room all the time.' She said, 'When I went out of the room, you was talking about what means we must take to prevent Mr. Hubbard's settlement; and when I returned, you were conversing on the same subject.'

EDMUND PROCTOR.'

"Mr. Proctor and wife were orthodox, and considered as friends of Mr. Payson. EBENEZER HUBBARD."

"Be it known to all whom it may concern, that we were present, when Rev. Mr. Payson of Leominster made his confession to Rev. Mr. Hubbard of this town, and were witnesses to his signature of the same; and we perfectly recollect, that when the said confession was forming, Mr. Payson wished to insert a sentence that went to impeach the veracity of Edmund and Elizabeth Proctor, and that, Mr. Hubbard objecting to this, the following sentence was substituted by Mr. Payson, with the consent of Mr. Hubbard—'from misapprehension or any other cause, though I would not implicate any one individual.'

"We further recollect, that when Mr. Hubbard observed to Mr. Payson, that he owed it to his character as a Christian to express his sorrow for having injured him, he declined to do it. And from the conduct and conversation of Mr. Payson, during this transaction, we were led to the conclusion, that Mr. Payson made and signed the confession, as a choice of evils, and without any change of opinion with respect to the reports he had circulated. And we further recollect, that after the confession was signed, Mr. Payson insisted that the matter should be put at rest, and not be made public; and Mr. Hubbard observed, that he had no inclination nor desire to injure Mr. Payson's character, and would not make the transaction public any further than was necessary for his own justification, to counteract the false reports which Mr. Payson had been the means of putting in circulation, destructive of his moral and ministerial character. And we also declare, that the circulation of copies of Mr. Payson's confession, in this and the neighbouring towns, was called for by a knowledge of the fact, that Mr. Payson's friends were industriously circulating a report that no such confession was made and signed by him.

ESEK WHITING.

"*Lunenburg, March* 24, 1831. WILLIAM HARRINGTON."

"The account given in this certificate, of the interview between Mr. Payson and myself, at the time of the signing of his acknowledgment, is strictly true. EBENEZER HUBBARD."

For *the present* I leave this case. I have fully and conclusively established the truth of every important position in my original statement. Have I not also fully and thoroughly refuted the assertions of Messrs. Putnam and Braman in your Review? If you wish for more evidence on any point, let me know it, and it shall be forth coming. I am sorry to be obliged to prove the declarations of orthodox ministers to be false; but you have compelled me. I can assure you that I have by no means employed all the proof now in my possession. If, after perusing all the above documents, any one can be in doubt respecting the *motives*

of these Rev. Gentlemen, I know not what evidence can remove his doubts. Does not their very fear of a civil prosecution establish this position? I leave the public to make their own comments upon such measures.

2. *Threatening.* I referred to an orthodox minister in Middlesex County who had been deterred from exchanges by the threatenings of your leaders. You profess never to have heard any complaints on this subject, and wonder that orthodox ministers should come to me with their grievances. The minister to whom I alluded is the Rev. Mr. Coggin of Tewksbury. The gentlemen to whom his complaints were uttered, are the Rev. Dr. Flint of Salem, and Jacob Osgood Esq. of Andover, whose certificates concerning the conversation are in my possession. And I can also assure you, that this same orthodox minister gave a much fuller account of the threatenings and drivings of your leaders, to my brother and the Hon. Joseph Locke of Billerica, whose certificates to this effect can be produced when necessary. More instances can be given if desired.

I will however give you a brief account of one case in which your leaders have lately carried their threatenings into execution. I refer to Southborough. An attempt is now making to break up that society, *simply* because Mr. Parker will not refuse to exchange with unitarians. I will present you with an extract from a letter in relation to this business. Here are the statements. "The people of the town of Southborough have heretofore been, I believe, pretty well united in sentiment. The Rev. Jeroboam Parker was settled there many years since as an *orthodox* minister. During the whole of his ministry, he has been uniform and consistent in his preaching, inculcating those sentiments peculiar to the orthodox. His character as a man, a minister, and a Christian has ever been above impeachment. *But* from the commencement of his ministry *to this time*, he has *exchanged* with *all congregational* ministers in regular standing in his vicinity. He has never come into the anti-christian, exclusive system. He has said, he would not come into that system, and that he could see no reason why he should, so long as his neighbouring ministers continued to practise and preach as they heretofore had done. This refusal was two high-handed, too independent, I had almost said, *too Christian*, to be passed over in silence by his orthodox brethren. Accordingly the following ministers met at Southborough about four or five weeks since to take the matter under consideration, *viz.* Rev. Mr. Rockwood of Westborough, Rev. Mr. Smith of East-Sudbury, Rev. Mr. Trask of Framingham, Rev. Mr. Baldwin of Berlin, and the Rev. Mr. Harding of Waltham. Delegates from some or all of the churches over which these gentlemen preside attended. The meeting was organized by choosing Mr. Rockwood moderator, and Capt. Webster Johnson of Southborough, a member of Mr. Parker's church, scribe or secretary.

A *notice* or *summons* to Mr. Parker was then drawn up by this self-constituted ecclesiastical council, in which it was stated, among other things, that it had been represented to that body, that Mr. Parker did not preach evangelical doctrines, that he was not evangelical in sentiment, and that the church in Southborough, over which he was set, was not evangelical, and called upon him to appear before them to show cause, why, for the reasons stated, a new evangelical church should not be established in that town. A messenger was despatched with the summons. He called at Mr. Parker's house, and was informed that Mr. P. was then in Boston. He departed without leaving his communication, or informing any one there, what was the object of his mission. He returned to the *council*, and gave information of his doings. This council then proceeded to business. They resolved, that whereas Rev. Mr. Parker and his church were not evangelical; and whereas DUE NOTICE *having been given him of the premises*, and he not appearing, *therefore* it is expedient that another church be formed in Southborough. The church was then formally organized; and about eleven or twelve persons were examined and admitted as members. They then prepared to sit down to the communion table. An invitation was given to all those present who were members of *any evangelical church* in regular standing; and several individuals of Mr. Parker's church, just declared not evangelical, came forward and partook of the sacrament. It should here be particularly noticed and remembered, that the platform, or creed, or confession of faith, or whatever you may term it, adopted and used by Mr. Parker and his church, is taken verbatim from that used by Mr. Rockwood, in his church at Westborough. I say *verbatim*, though I do not know that any comparison of copies has been made. There is not any doubt however but it is *substantially* the same. And as that is considered as coming pretty well up to the mark, that adopted by the *council* for the new church, (for I presume the council prescribe what shall be believed) is substantially the same as Mr. Parker's. Within a few days after this council adjourned, a committee, chosen by Mr. Parker's society, called on Capt. Johnson, to procure a copy of their proceedings. He consulted with Mr. Rockwood, I think, who advised him to comply with the request; but before the copy was furnished, counter advice was received. Thus, Sir, have I given you an account of a transaction of the most intolerant and illiberal kind, serving to prove what the object of the exclusionists is, to wit, an acquisition of power, and a determination to *coerce* their fellow men to adopt their faith and their exclusive system. There may be a trifling variation, perhaps, in the facts as above related, from those which actually occurred; but I hold myself responsible to prove them *substantially* as I have stated them." No comments are necessary on such an outrageous and unprincipled proceeding. — *Letters*, p. 19. *Review*, p. 29.

3. *Oppression.* I related a case of an orthodox minister in Middlesex County, who is prevented from exchanging with unitarians by the oppressive measures of the Association to which he belongs. This you have not dared to deny; for you doubtless have some knowledge of these exclusive and tyrannical regulations. But you say "no instance is adduced, *or can be*, to justify" a representation I gave in the next paragraph. Take the following as a sample of the many I can produce.

"*Rev. Sir,*

"In your Letters to Professor Stuart, you request those who are in possession of any facts, touching the question in controversy between yourself and your antagonists, to communicate the same. Having a knowledge of *two* such facts, I take the liberty of communicating them, with the assurance that they are founded in truth.

"The *first* is simply this. The Rev. Mr. Farley, recently the Preceptor of Atkinson Academy, was employed for several past years to preach for the Calvinistic Society in that place, and in consequence of the smallness of the Society and its limited finances, he received fifty-four dollars of his compensation from their Domestic Missionary Fund, through application made by the Trustees of said Society. This, in connexion with the small tax levied in the Society, and the proceeds of his small school, afforded a bare support to his large family. He is a man of great sobriety of manners and pureness of character, and ranks high as a scholar. His ministrations were very satisfactory to the people, and he soon secured the universal esteem, not only of his own society, but of all the inhabitants of the town. He passed several years in this place, faithful to his complex charge, totally unsuspicious of the attempts that were made to destroy his usefulness, and to deprive him of his only means of support. But although he was unsuspicious, the *Association*, to which he belonged, were moved with suspicions of his soundness in the faith. In their secret councils, they determined to call him to account. Accordingly they addressed him, intimating that certain reports were in circulation implicating his orthodoxy, and requiring him to give in writing the leading articles of his faith, and this, though he knew not on what authority they made such a jesuitical demand, he candidly and honestly complied with, giving them an explicit and full *exposé* of his views, with his reasons for thus believing. So far as I have been able to elicit his views, he is a firm believer in the *trinity* and *atonement*, but denies *total depravity* and *irrespective election.* But to their mightinesses this semi-heretical document was quite unsatisfactory; he could not pronounce the shibboleth of their creed, and what think you was the result? Verily this tribunal, in the true Genevan spirit, pronounced him a heretic, and if this had been all, it would have been as harmless as some of the papal bulls; but they were not satisfied in closing against him the doors of

heaven; they wished him to feel some immediate effects of their holy displeasure, and accordingly they inform him, that they are compelled, *in conscience*, to consider him as an alien, and to exclude him from their fellowship, informing him at the same time, that the fifty-four dollars hitherto contributed to his support, would be withheld. But this was not all. They informed the Trustees of said Society, that their minister was not sound in the faith, and that they must withhold their support, unless they should discharge him and procure some other man, whose views coincided with their own. Thus a large portion of the society, some urged, perhaps, by interest, and others by bigotry, cast from their bosom a man, who had for some time rejoiced with them in their prosperity, and given them consolation in the hour of their adversity; and cast him upon the wide world, with a numerous offspring to support, and totally destitute of the means.

This, Sir, seems to me to be highly confirmatory of one of your positions; and this, being a FACT, may perhaps, be useful to you, if, according to the sapient 'Recorder' and 'Spirit of the Pilgrims,' what you have already published, is but 'a tissue of falsehoods.' With gratitude for the great good you have done the cause of truth, and with great respect, I am your friend, ————."

Letters, p. 21. *Review*, p. 47.

4. *Concealment.* I asserted that orthodox candidates had obtained settlements over comparatively liberal societies, by concealing their real theological sentiments, and their real views respecting exchanging with unitarians. Your answer is contained in these words: "*We* have never known an instance of such concealment, and *presume* none can be mentioned." I would merely reply, that *we* have known several such cases of concealment, and *presume* very many can be mentioned. I have a great assortment of such instances on hand, and can accommodate you with almost any pattern. I will give you one specimen; and if you wish for others of a lighter or darker shade, make known your wants, and they shall be gratified.

"*Dear Sir,* *Raynham, March* 23, 1831.

"In answer to your call for information, I have to say, that I am acquainted with a case where an 'orthodox candidate has obtained a settlement over a comparatively liberal society, by concealing his real theological sentiments, and his real views respecting exchanges with unitarians.' I allude to the congregational society in Raynham, as it existed in 1823; and to the Rev. Enoch Sanford, now minister of the first congregational society in that place. The facts which I shall communicate will prove, I think, these *three* positions. 1. That the congregational society in Raynham *was*, in 1823, the time of Mr. Sanford's settlement, and *had been* for some time previous, *liberal.* 2. That Mr. Sanford, while a candidate, represented himself to be an *anti-calvinist*, and a *liberal man;* and as such was settled. 3. That after his settle-

ment he gradually *assumed Calvinistic ground*, and became an *exclusionist.*

"1. The society in Raynham *was*, and *had been liberal.* This is a matter of general notoriety. Dr. Fobes, the minister next but one preceding Mr. Sanford, was, long before his death, a *unitarian.* His successor, Mr. Hull, was, in 1812, ordained by a *liberal council;* and it is a remark which applies with equal and perfect truth both to Dr. Fobes and Mr. Hull, that they exchanged more frequently with the *liberal* than they did with the orthodox ministers of the vicinity. In 1823 this society was destitute of a minister. In the spring of that year Mr. Sanford was employed to preach. While preaching as a candidate, he was told by one of the society, that the parish was *not Calvinistic;* that there were (and this was a well known fact) but *six* or *eight Calvinists* in the parish, and that if the society settled a minister, it would of course settle a *liberal* one. This society then *was liberal.*

"2. Mr. Sanford while a candidate represented himself to be a *liberal man*, and as such was settled. When the remarks just mentioned were made to Mr. Sanford, he said in reply, that if he should settle in Raynham, *he should settle as a liberal man, and not as a Calvinist*, or words to that effect. While a candidate he boarded at different times, for nearly five months, in the families of the deacons of the church, both of whom were *unitarians.* While with them his conversation on religious subjects was uniformly *liberal*, and his prayers, both in the domestic circle and in public, *unitarian.* A short time previous to his settlement, he invited a neighbouring orthodox minister to preach a lecture for him. The orthodox minister consented, and in his lecture attempted to defend some Calvinistic tenets. Mr. Sanford, who was in the pulpit with the preacher, was apprehensive that the latter was going farther than the people were, *as yet*, ready to bear. He therefore made attempts, as the minister who officiated himself declared, to prevent the delivery of the *most obnoxious parts;* and when subsequently one of the members of the church waited on Mr. Sanford and represented to him that the feelings of many were very much hurt by passages contained in that lecture, Mr. Sanford replied, that '*his own feelings were equally hurt.*' Mr. Sanford repeatedly, and in the hearing of many individuals, expressed his disbelief in the tenets of Calvinism; and with such frequency and emphasis had he done this, that it was confidently asserted before his settlement, that '*he could not be an honest man if he was a Calvinist.*' But the people in Raynham knew that other societies had been deceived, and they feared the possibility of there being a misunderstanding between Mr. Sanford and themselves. Accordingly many intelligent individuals availed themselves of every opportunity to converse with him concerning his theological sentiments, and his real views respecting exchanges with unitarians. His replies to questions addressed to him betokened a liberal mind, and a determination to pur-

sue a liberal course. At one time *four* of the leading men in the town sought and obtained an interview with him just before he received his call to settle, for the purpose of ascertaining decisively what his conduct would be, in case he should become their minister, in relation to exchanges. One of their number asked him frankly, whether, if he was settled, *he should exchange with all regularly settled ministers of the vicinity or not?* Mr. Sandford replied directly that *he should.* After all this the society felt prepared to vote on the question of giving Mr. Sanford a call. The liberal party voted *for*, the Calvinists *opposed* his settlement. The former of course prevail. Mr. Sandford concludes to settle. A committee of the church wait on him, to confer with him in appointing the ordaining council. He mentions *three unitarians* first, and then two Calvinists; but apologizes for naming the latter by saying that one was the minister of his native parish, and the other a particular friend of his, a professor in a college. He requests one of the neighbouring unitarian ministers to give him the right hand of fellowship, which the unitarian minister did. The other unitarian ministers mentioned by Mr. Sanford were on the council, and took part in the ordination. Soon after his settlement, Mr. Sanford joins the unitarian association of Bristol county. Thus Mr. Sanford represented himself to be a *liberal man*, and as such was settled.

"3. After his settlement he gradually assumed Calvinistic ground, and became an exclusionist. About *six months* after his ordination, Mr. Sanford exchanged with the unitarian clergyman who gave him the right hand of fellowship. Mr. Sanford was then heard to say, *that he should not exchange with that minister again.* In a few months the same clergyman applied for another exchange, and was refused in a manner and under circumstances, which, if Mr. Sanford can recall without pain, we shall not envy his heart. The reason assigned for refusing to exchange was, *that his orthodox friends would not exchange with him, if he exchanged with unitarians.* He was told by the clergyman alluded to, that the Raynham people were not prepared for this; that they would not consent to have their pulpit in the keeping of orthodox ministers; that he (Mr. Sanford) was settled not a year before, with the express understanding that he should exchange with all neighbouring ministers. Mr. Sanford replied, '*that he did not preach to please men*'; *laymen* he must have *meant*, since he avowed his *subserviency* to the will of the orthodox *clergy.* This refusal created much astonishment and excitement in Raynham. It appeared evident that Mr. Sanford was becoming more exclusive and Calvinistic. His prayers began to be addressed to a *Triune God.* His exchanges with liberal ministers became less and less frequent. With some he had positively refused to exchange. Affairs continued in this posture some time. Mr. Sanford was asked why he did not exchange with liberal men as often as he had done formerly. He replied that he had endeavoured to obtain

exchanges with the unitarian ministers of two adjoining towns, but that *they both* had sent back word, that it was not convenient for them to exchange. Inquiry was immediately made of both those clergymen, who affirmed, that *they had received no application from Mr. Sanford for an exchange!* The excitement in Raynham increased. Mr. Sanford had recourse to his old stories, and solemnly declared in the presence of *three* of his liberal parishioners, that he was *no Calvinist*, and as much *Arminian* as the individual whom he then addressed. But the time had gone by when the people could be deceived by such declarations. In the fall of 1827, measures were taken by the liberal party to withdraw from the old society. One of the three individuals just alluded to, a gentleman of wealth and influence, and one whom any society would be glad to retain, told Mr. Sanford that if he would make his conduct appear consistent, he should not withdraw. He also observed, that although in *his* presence he had declared he was no *Calvinist*, some orthodox members of the society affirmed, that in *their* presence he had avowed he *was* a Calvinist. Upon this Mr. Sanford denied that he ever said he was *not* a Calvinist, and persisted in asserting that he *had always been* a Calvinist! The gentleman told him, that he had said *he was an Arminian*, and that he could not be mistaken on this point. Mr. Sanford persisted in his denial of having ever said that he was an Arminian, but finally allowed that if he *did* pronounce himself an Arminian, he meant no more than this, that whereas Arminius believed in the doctrine of the Trinity, he, *quoad hoc*, in relation to this point, was an Arminian! The gentleman, as may be easily imagined, was far from being satisfied with such reasoning as this. He withdrew. Mr. Sanford, now perceiving that a loss of the best part of his parish was unavoidable, no longer endeavoured to conceal those Calvinistic sentiments, which, from his conversation, his prayers, his preaching, and from his exchanges, it was evident he had long entertained, and which in a meeting of the church he avowed he had always believed. It was thus that he gradually assumed Calvinistic ground, and became an exclusionist.

I have thus stated the facts which, I think, prove the three positions asserted. To the truth of every assertion which I have made, I have the names of 'weighty and honorable men,' who are ready and willing to testify. Yours sincerely, ————————."

5. *Rev. John A. Albro.* I related some of the circumstances which induced me to believe this orthodox minister had practised a most unrighteous concealment. I had a large number of very clear, strong, and indisputable cases of this nature; but I preferred mentioning the one at East Chelmsford for several reasons. It was an instance of late occurrence; it was in our own neighbourhood; it was perpetrated by an Andover student; he had denied his guilt in conversation, and I *knew* it could be proved to the satisfaction of any jury on earth. When he was about to exchange with my brother, he asked Cyrus

Baldwin, Esq., then a liberal man, what sermons he had best preach in Billerica. The answer contained these sentiments. "Any sermon you have preached here during your six months' ministry will be liberal enough for Mr. Whitman's society." Had not his religious sentiments been thus far concealed? He was also frequently speaking of "*our third independent party*," with the Rev. Mr. Withington at its head, who had preached his ordination sermon, and who has had the *independence* to withstand thus far the overbearing influence of the exclusionists. He likewise stated that he should be considered a heretic by Mr. Todd and his society at Groton. I can assure the Reverend gentleman that his conversation with Cyrus Baldwin and others of the society, with the Rev. Mr. Allen and my brother, and especially at the tea-table of the Hon. Joseph Locke, are well and accurately remembered; and full certificates of the same can be furnished, when necessary, to prove the truth of my assertions. Had he declared an alteration of his views respecting exchanges, and doctrinal preaching, he would have preserved the appearance of honesty; but by boldly denying what can be proved by the most conclusive evidence and the most unexceptionable witness, he has forfeited the confidence of all but thorough-going zealots.

I will now present you sufficient testimony to establish my original positions, and refute the assertions of the Reverend gentleman from East Chelmsford. The first is a letter from my brother, who took a part in his ordination. The second is from the Hon. Joseph Locke, who was a member of the ordaining council. The third is from the committee of the society, and is simply designed as a very mild refutation of Mr. Albro's statements. In conclusion I will give the Rev. Mr. Allen's statement respecting the three church members to whom Mr. Albro alluded.

"*Billerica, April* 4, 1831.

"*My dear Brother,*

"I have read, not without astonishment, Mr. Albro's statement of what occurred, relative to ministerial exchanges, before the council at the time of his ordination. He observes, 'Before any business was transacted, Mr. Whitman of Billerica desired me to state what course I intended to pursue relative to ministerial intercourse after my ordination.' The fact, however, was this. In declining to act as the scribe of the council, I assigned as my reason for so doing, that my acting as a member of the ordaining council would depend on the answer which the candidate should return to a question that I should propose to him at *the proper time;* and that consequently it would, in my view, be inconsistent for me to act as scribe. When the proper time arrived, that is, *after*, NOT *before*, the transaction of the usual business of such occasions, I proposed my question. I asked for no *pledge;* but simply requested Mr. Albro to state *honestly* his *present* views and feelings relative to a friendly ministerial intercourse with myself, including *pulpit*

exchanges. My object in proposing this question was, to obtain light to guide me in a consistent course in the part I should act in relation to his ordination. Mr. Albro affects to understand my object to be a very different one from this; for he says, 'They,' meaning Mr. Allen and myself, 'were not willing to have me free to do what I should judge best. They wished to bind me with the fetters of a solemn and public pledge to exchange with them, whether I could conscientiously do it or not. This is the freedom these worthy champions of religious liberty offered me. You are free to follow *our* conscience, but not to judge for yourself.' Mr. Albro, fully understanding my question, hesitated as to answering it. His particular friend, the Rev. Mr. Clement, then stated, that he 'felt' or *was* authorized to say, that Mr. Albro's course would be satisfactory to all the members of the council, and that Mr. Albro being present, would express his dissent, if he thought proper. Mr. Albro expressed no dissent; but, by his silence, confirmed the truth of Mr. Clement's declaration. The purport or meaning of that declaration was, that *Mr. Albro was at that time honestly disposed to hold a friendly intercourse, including pulpit exchanges, with the unitarian ministers of the council.* By giving *satisfaction* to Mr. Allen and myself, nothing *less* than this could *honestly* be meant, because *this and this only was the point in debate.* The matter was so understood, unquestionably, at the time, by Mr. Albro, as he expressed no dissent when appealed to by the Hon. J. Locke, and as he permitted Mr. Allen and myself to aid in his ordination under the influence of such an understanding, without intimating that we had received an erroneous impression respecting his views and feelings concerning exchanges.

On the groundwork of such an understanding of the matter it was, that Mr. Albro, some months after his ordination, solicited an exchange with me, which took place accordingly. At this time the following remarks were addressed to me by Cyrus Baldwin, Esq., who was as well acquainted as any gentleman in the society with Mr. Albro's views and feelings relative to this subject, and will now affirm that he expected Mr. Albro would continue to exchange with unitarians. Speaking of the condition and prospects of the society, he observed, 'Our fears arise from one quarter *only;* we fear that the liberal clergy around us may stand aloof from Mr. Albro, and compel him to enter into the exclusive system; if they will be free to exchange with him, we shall be in harmony and shall do well; for *he is willing to exchange with them.* And,' continued he, 'I hope you will be always ready to exchange with him, whenver he shall desire it.' In view of facts and circumstances like these, Mr. Albro came before the public and says, 'I exchanged *once* with Mr. Whitman, which was *all* I intended and *more* than I promised.' On this painful subject I shall say no more, although *very much more* might be said; all concurring to prove, that Mr. Albro understood my question, and that he knew in what sense I understood

his answer, without intimating that I was mistaken. I leave it to an impartial public to decide whether the Reverend gentleman, in this important transaction, has 'provided things honest in the sight of all men,' or whether he has *attempted* to practise a 'cunning craftiness.' My apology for saying thus much is, that transactions like this have a deep connexion with the liberties, the order, the peace, and the prosperity of our churches.

"REV. B. WHITMAN. Yours, N. WHITMAN."

"*Rev. and Dear Sir,* "*Billerica, March* 24, 1831.

"Upon looking over the Review of your Letters to Professor Stuart, I was rather surprised at the statement of the Rev. Mr. Albro respecting what took place in the council at his ordination in relation to ministerial exchanges. There were reasons which impressed the circumstances of that transaction very strongly upon my mind, and I think I cannot be mistaken in my recollection respecting it. *After* the usual proceedings were gone through, and Mr. Albro had undergone an examination at considerable length, by orthodox members of the council, respecting theological doctrines, in which it was pretty apparent, from the indefiniteness of his answers, that he had not very distinct notions upon the subjects of inquiry, or did not choose to commit himself; the Rev. Messrs. Allen and Whitman of the council wished to be informed by Mr. Albro, what were his views and intentions respecting ministerial intercourse and exchanges. They said they made the inquiry in consequence of events that had taken place in several societies; and to enable them to act consistently. It would be absurd for them to coöperate in the ordination of one who would not allow them to be gospel ministers, nor hold intercourse with them as such. Doctor Church, and the Rev. Messrs. Stearns and Beckwith, resisted the inquiry, upon the ground that Mr. Albro ought not to give any pledge or express any opinion, as he might alter his views upon the subject, and find himself embarrassed by it. In reply it was said, no pledge was demanded, but simply an honest expression of present views and feelings. There was considerable debate, some warmth of feeling, but no immediate prospect of a termination, when Mr. Clement, a *minister* and delegate from Andover, who was known to have preached as a candidate in the society before Mr. Albro, rose and said, that, 'he was well acquainted with the views of the society on the subject, and he presumed he also understood those of the different members of the council; and that he *was* or *felt*,' [if Mr. Albro has studied quibbles sufficiently to find out the difference in this case, he may take his choice,] '*authorized* to say, that Mr. Albro's course, in relation to exchanges, would be such as to give satisfaction to every member of the council.' He then said, that 'Mr. Albro was present and could contradict this statement if he chose.' Mr. Albro was *silent*. Here Mr. Albro, in his letter says, 'The subject was drop-

ped.' He ought to have added, that when Mr. Clement had made the foregoing declaration, professing to do it as the authorized organ of Mr. Albro, a delegate" [the Hon. Joseph Locke] "observed, that if Mr. Clement was authorized to make the declaration he had made, which there was no reason to doubt, as Mr. Albro was present, and did not intimate the contrary; and if Mr. Albro was *sincere* (and we were *bound* to believe he was) he presumed it was satisfactory to all the council; and immediately made a motion to that effect, which was unanimously adopted; and the council immediately proceeded to the meetinghouse. So far was this inquiry from being *premature*, and before the other business had been transacted, as Mr. Albro alleges.

"Mr. Albro says, 'he did exchange once with Mr. Whitman of Billerica, and that was all he *intended*, and more than he promised.' Here then he, by implication, admits that he promised something, and he certainly can do no less, for to every moral and *legal* intent, (the gentleman ought to know, for he is a lawyer as well as a clergyman,) he was as perfectly bound, by the declarations and assurances of Mr. Clement as though he had made them himself. What then did he promise; why, to give satisfaction to all the members of the council. In other words, as every body present understood it, that he would exchange with the unitarian clergymen, especially Mr. Allen and Mr. Whitman. He says the two last mentioned gentlemen 'took the same ground,' and undoubtedly entertained similar expectations. And yet he says he intended *only* to exchange with Mr. Whitman. This looks to me very much like *concealment*, or something worse.

"I am, Dear Sir, very respectfully, your friend,

"REV. B. WHITMAN. JOSEPH LOCKE."

Perhaps you will ask what circumstances could have impressed this transaction so deeply on the mind of this writer. If I may be allowed the *Yankee* privilege of guessing, I should guess he suspected the minister's honesty, and made his suspicions a subject of conversation on his return from the ordination.

I now present you with a letter from the Committee of the liberal Society.

"*Rev. Bernard Whitman,* *Chelmsford, March* 25, 1831.

"*Dear Sir,*—A Review of your Letters to Professor Stuart has reached us. Appended to the Review is a letter from Mr. Albro, which is written with some ability, and, to those unacquainted with facts partially stated, and with facts not stated, must appear plausible. Like an ingenious and practised attorney, he understands the management of a bad cause. The undersigned, though they are averse to controversy and have in time past endured much to avoid it, feel it to be proper and expedient to do away any wrong impressions which that extraordinary communication has made on the public mind. It is matter of serious regret that there is occasion to arrest the attention of the

public a single moment for such a purpose. For the society, in whose behalf we act, has been, from the first, pacific and conciliatory, as appears from the memorial now in your possession. And it is and has been the prevailing opinion of the society and often expressed, that there was no wish to control Mr. Albro's opinions or preaching, and that, had he continued to preach as he did the first year after his ordination, and to advocate ministerial intercourse with his neighbours, as he did during that period, and as was reasonably expected, they would have continued to patronize and support him. But when he adopted the exclusive system in regard to exchanges, and dogmatically advanced doctrines and urged sentiments 'of doubtful disputation,' they were constrained to declare themselves dissatisfied, and to form themselves into a separate society; and as there was no *trust deed* system to abridge their rights and perplex their movements, they not only supported preaching, but gained fair and rightful possession of the house of worship. It is not intended *at present* to make a formal and full reply to Mr. Albro's letter, but it carries with it such palpable misstatements, that it calls for more severe animadversion than the committee feel willing to publish. It may be expected that the liberal part of the ordaining council will correct the misstatements, there made, of its doings; and in reference to other parts of it you are authorized to publish the following:

"1. The Rev. Mr. Whitman was not the last unitarian preacher in the place, as stated in the letter; but he was one of the *first*, and supplied about six months. How far this is a specimen of the author's correctness in other statements the public will judge.

"2. Mr. Albro could not expect to be questioned on his theological sentiments or ministerial intercourse, since, as he expressly says, he was not employed as a candidate. But when he had received a call to settle, several persons conversed with him, and there was a general understanding that he cherished liberal feelings, and he was distinctly told that, should he adopt the exclusive system, a number would leave him. He often declared himself an advocate for such free intercourse after his ordination, and the impression was cherished by the liberal part of the society for more than a year. But it was at length found that he deceived the people and practised concealment.

"3. When the proposal was made, at a Parish meeting, to give Mr. Albro a call to settle, it was quite unexpected and even surprising to a large portion of the meeting. The measure was thought premature. This may appear from the fact, that there were but *six votes* given to invite him to become their minister. And he must have known, from many circumstances, that there was a marked opposition against the course pursued; and there are many who to this day are unable to account for his settling, in such a state of things.

"4. In regard to the proportion of unitarians and universalists, and their motives in acting, reference ought to be had to a higher tribunal. It is however worthy of remark, that, after all we have seen and still see, in the periodicals of the day, the orthodox and universalists in this region readily coalesce, sympathize, and coöperate in secular affairs, and seem to have a good understanding with each other with respect to some of our religious concerns.

"5. The reply Mr. Albro made to a temperate and respectful *memorial* addressed to him, disclosed such a state of feeling and such an ungracious spirit, that it precluded all hopes of accommodation, and occasioned, more than any other circumstance, the deliberate purpose of forming a separate society.

"6. It ought to be understood that the liberal part of the ordaining council appeared to have no desire to control the opinions or course of the candidate. They seemed perfectly willing he 'should pursue the course he should judge best.' They wished him to declare, on that interesting occasion, what course he *then* judged best, that they might act understandingly, and that there might be no deception or concealment, to which he seemed inclined. The extract from Dr. Church's letter gives the opinion of an individual, and such management and collision may have often occurred in councils he has attended. In the present case we have the opinions of two clergymen and a layman, which are of a very different import. 'So much for the pledge.'

"7. The covenant adopted by those who were afterwards gathered into a church state was comprehensive and liberal. The five ministers, invited to gather and organize a church, saw fit to make some alterations in the covenant, to which they reluctantly assented. And being afterwards dissatisfied with the alterations imposed, set them aside, and again adopted the first form, which continued in use till after Mr. Albro's ordination.

"8. It is not easy to conceive, if a majority of the society were universalists, as it is more than intimated in the letter, how a vote could be obtained to deny them the meeting-house. The truth is, no such application was ever made after Mr. Albro came to the place. And it may here be added, that it is matter of grateful reflection, that the affairs of the society have been conducted in peace and harmony, that the manner of gaining possession of the meeting-house was on *their* part fair and honorable, and that public worship has been attended and maintained with exemplary order and constancy. 'The favorite weapon' of slander and misrepresentation, of which Mr. Albro speaks, and of which his letter seems not to be wholly destitute, has been worn and blunted in the service of his Reverend friends, and could not be wielded with equal adroitness by liberal Christians, who are taught to rely on the force and progress of truth and on the justness of their cause.

"9. There are other things in the letter which an enlightened and impartial public would disapprove and censure, but the committee subjoin only one further remark. It is this, we see in the letter less of the gentleman and of the Christian than we should have expected, and the suggestions thrown out in regard to the *Doctrines of the Cross*, *Sabbath Schools*, *Bible Classes*, &c., are known to the public of this village to be uncandid and incorrect.

"With sentiments of respect, we are your obedient servants,

WILLIAM ADAMS,
EBENEZER ADAMS,
CHARLES BENT,
} *Committee of the North Congregational Society.*

"*Chelmsford, March* 25, 1831."

Mr. Albro finishes his letter with the following sentence — "You are authorized to say, that three members of Mr. Allen's church have been refused letters to mine." In answer to this statement, I have received a letter from the Rev. Mr. Allen, from which I present you the following extract. "It is a little remarkable that Mr. Albro should notice as a fault my refusal to furnish three members of my church with letters of dismission and recommendation, *two* only of which *ever applied* for them, and they not until after irregular conduct, and the most palpable violation of covenant engagements with this church, so that, instead of commendation, they deserved discipline and censure. Besides, he well knew that such letters were not properly respected by the overbearing and exclusive party to which he seems pledged, notwithstanding the many fair promises and great show of catholicism, which he boastingly made to me soon after his ordination. It is well known that such letters have often been treated with contempt, and Mr. Albro probably regrets that he has not an opportunity of furnishing his employers and his party with another example of the kind. In one of the instances to which he alludes, I expressly assured the person, applying for a recommendation, that it would be granted, provided he would bring me a certificate from Mr. Albro that such recommendation would be accepted. The person himself supposed it would not, and returned no more to the ark whence he had departed. I ask then the use or the propriety of giving letters to orthodox churches, who stamp them under their feet and turn again and rend you.

"As a proof that I do not judge uncharitably, I will now relate to you the case of one of those three, to which I suppose Mr. Albro refers, although she never applied to me for a letter. She is now between seventy and eighty years of age, and in her dotage. She joined this church in 1781 during the ministry of the Rev. Mr. Bridge, who was reputed orthodox in his time. She sat under Dr. Packard's ministry while he remained pastor of this church; to whom she still remains exceedingly attached. Living in the borders of Lowell, and within half a mile of Dr. Packard's meeting-house, Mr. Albro called

on her, and charged her not to attend Dr. Packard's meeting, as she says, and told her, that if she did not remove her connexions with my church and join his, *she could not be saved.* These are her words. She told him that she was old, and should not have an opportunity of attending communion many times any where, and that she had always been satified with me and with Dr. Packard. And what, think you, was the result? This aged woman, with one foot in the grave, was overcome (a noble conquest truly) by Mr. Albro's eloquence; and a few sabbaths since was propounded to his church, as though she had never made a profession, though she had been fifty years a church member, and as if she had just emerged from a state of heathenism. If such things are approved, what measures ought to be condemned?" Comments are unnecessary. *Letters*, pp. 108—112. *Review*, pp. 57—78.

III. Ecclesiastical Tribunals.

You have contradicted several of my statements under this section. Only two of your attacks are deserving of the least notice.

1. *Brookfield.* I made several assertions in relation to the orthodox proceedings in Brookfield. You have denied the truth of several of them, and brought some charges against the unitarians of that town. I will now defend my positions, and refute your statements with satisfactory evidence.

First. You have accused me of saying several things in relation to this case, which I never uttered. You assert, that I charged the orthodox seceders with carrying off the Bible, plate, and records. I made no such charge. You assert that I attributed the dismission of the Rev. Mr. Stone to his introduction of a new and more orthodox creed. No such idea entered my mind, or has ever been published in my Letters. You assert, that I represented Mr. Stone as dismissed from the *church.* I gave no such representation. I challenge you or any other man to find either of these statements in my Letters. *Letters*, p. 51. *Review*, pp. 31—78.

Secondly. I asserted, "that the creed or covenant was originally so liberal, that Christians of different religious opinions could honestly give their assent to its requisitions." Your answer to this statement is contained in the following sentence. "The original covenant of this church was trinitarian and orthodox." I will give you the covenant to which I alluded, and leave it for our readers to decide if my assertion is not literally true.

"March 11th, 1801. Rev. Mr. Stone was admitted a member of the church in the second precinct in Brookfield, and, on the 12th of April following, the church met and chose a committee to consider what regulations be proper to be adopted for admission to the church, and on the 19th of the same month the church adopted the following creed, viz.:—

"We now, in the presence of the heart-searching God and before this assembly, profess our belief in the Christian Religion. We believe in One only living and true God; who is the wise Creator, the kind Preserver, and the righteous Governor of the universe. We believe his Son, Jesus Christ, to be the Redeemer and Saviour of the world; and that through him we have access by one spirit to the Father. We acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, and the rule of life; and in deep contrition for our offences, we humbly ask God's forgiveness and mercy, through the atoning blood of Christ. In this profession and belief, we now devote ourselves to the Lord Jehovah; sincerely choosing God *the Father* for our God and Father; the Son of God for our Redeemer, Lord, and Saviour; and the Holy Ghost for our comforter, guide, and sanctifier; that for the residue of our lives, we will take the Gospel of Christ for the rule of our faith and practice; that we will earnestly strive to forsake every false way, and will carefully guard against the occasions of sinning; that we will endeavour to make continual advancement in Christian knowledge and virtue, and to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless, as it does, or as, upon careful inquiry, shall appear to be our duty; and we promise that we will walk orderly as members of this church, that we will submit to its discipline, and that we will do our best endeavour to preserve its peace, to promote edification, to extend the knowledge and influence of the Christian religion, and at all times to walk worthy of our holy vocation."

This creed trinitarian and orthodox! Would to God we had thousands of such trinitarian and orthodox covenants! Why did Mr. Stone change it in 1825 for a very different one? I ask every honest man, if I did not utter the literal truth, when I called this creed so *liberal*, that Christians of *different religious opinions* could *honestly* give their assent to its requisitions. *Letters*, p. 51. *Review*, pp. 31—79.

Thirdly. I asserted that Mr. Stone was dismissed, and a unitarian settled in his place. This you deny outright. You expect to escape from the charge of falsehood by declaring that he has not been dismissed from the orthodox seceders of the second church. I said nothing about the church; and *Mr. Stone admits that his civil contract with the parish was dissolved.* And why was he not dismissed from the church? Because he violated a written agreement. The following vote was passed by the congregation. "Voted, that whenever the church shall unite with the parish in settling another pastor, he [Mr. Stone] shall have his pastoral relation to the *church* dissolved according to ecclesiastical usage." To this proposal Mr. Stone assented in writing. After the church and society had united and settled a pastor, he abandoned the church, and would not fulfil his contract; and now declares he has never been dismissed, because he induced a majority

of the communicants to follow him to another place of worship. Let the public look at this management. *Letters*, p. 51. *Review*, pp. 31 — 78.

Fourthly. I asserted that the male members of the church who remained were excommunicated by the seceders; and that they were charged, among other things, with a breach of covenant engagements. You assert that one was excommunicated for absenting himself from public worship previous to the secession of Mr. Stone, and the other for immoral conduct. I wish to ask a few questions on this statement, and I ask for an *honest* answer. Were not these gentlemen in good and regular standing at the time of Mr. Stone's secession? Yes. Were they under any church censure at this time? No. Had they followed Mr. Stone to his new place of worship, would they have been excommunicated? No. How long did Mr. Stone wait to see if they would join his feeble party, before passing sentence of condemnation? Some eight or nine months. Has not Mr. Stone any member in his church *now*, whose conduct he *knows* to be immoral, much more deserving of censure, than that of either of the unitarians? I put the question to his conscience. If so, why is not church discipline administered? Because he adheres to the seceders. Is it not then *plain as* daylight, that these two gentlemen were excommunicated for their adherence to unitarian preaching? But you say that one was excommunicated for breaking covenant engagements. You have the covenant before you. Did he covenant to follow a fallible man from the house where his fathers worshipped? Did he ever covenant to adhere to the orthodox doctrines? Did he ever covenant to become no wiser on religious subjects? How then did he break any covenant engagements? *Letters*, p. 51. *Review*, pp. 31 — 79.

Fifthly. I have defended my statements respecting the Brookfield case. But Mr. Stone has made a complaint, which requires a brief notice. He brings a charge against the unitarian church in this note. "In February, 1828, the unitarian minister, and those associated with him, calling themselves the church, *passed a vote of* EXCLUSION *against the whole church which had left the parish, pastor and all.*" Now this is not true, as I will prove by the votes themselves. Here you have a true copy from the records.

"*February* 3, 1828. After service in the afternoon a meeting of the church was held, at which documents were laid before the church, from which it appeared, that brothers John Murray and Jason Walker had been dismissed with censure, by Rev. Mr. Stone and other seceders from the church, styling themselves the second church in Brookfield, from the church of the Evangelical Society; whereupon the pastor, and brothers Stebbins and Murray, were appointed a committee to report what measure should be adopted in relation to this subject; to report in what relation Rev. Micah Stone and other

seceders, who had joined the Evangelical Society without a dismission, stand to this church; and to report what measure should be adopted in regard to the church plate. Feb. 10. At an adjourned meeting of the church, at which all the brethren were present, the committee appointed at the last meeting reported, that it is expedient the following votes be passed by the church, and communicated to those whom it may concern. Voted, that we regard the act of Rev. Micah Stone, and other seceders (eight in number) from this church, pretending to pass ecclesiastical censure upon two members of our church, (who were recognised as a regular church of Christ by an ecclesiastical council, containing some of the most distinguished divines and jurists in our state, and who, with others since added to their number, are recognised as the second church in Brookfield by the laws of the land,) as a violation of Christian charity, and as tending to excite party spirit and unsocial passions, rather than advance the cause of *Him*, who came to promote peace on earth and good will amongst men. *Voted, that we regard Rev. Mr. Stone, and all those former members of this church, who have become legal members of the Evangelical Society,* AS HAVING DISSOLVED THEIR CONNEXION WITH THIS CHURCH *by deserting it, refusing to act with it, and becoming members of a new society, and that we do not hold ourselves bound to watch over them.* Voted, that we regret that Rev. Mr. Stone has not seen fit to fulfil his promise of having his pastoral relation to this church *formally dissolved according to congregational usage;* nor even to fulful his promise of returning an answer to those, who thought themselves bound by a vote of the parish to make him the offer of such a formal dissolution of his connexion with them. Voted, that we regret that the seceders from this church, who have joined the Evangelical Society, have not, according to congregational usage, asked a regular dismission from this church, which would have been regularly granted them, as this church does not covet dominion over the conscience or faith of any disciple of Christ, remembering the words of an Apostle: 'Why dost thou judge thy brother, and why dost thou set at nought thy brother, for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.' "

You thus see for yourself the incorrectness of Mr. Stone's statement. You see that the unitarians neither admonished, *excluded*, expelled, nor excommunicated the orthodox seceders. Could they have consistently done otherwise? If you cannot see the difference between such a vote, and a damnatory sentence of expulsion, I envy neither your head nor your heart. *Letters*, p. 51. *Review*, p. 80.

2. *Waltham.* In illustrating some of my positions, I referred to certain transactions of the orthodox church in Waltham. You have denied the truth of some of my statements. I will examine your insinuations and assertions, and defend my original positions.

First. I stated that only fifteen votes could be obtained from more than one hundred voters for the continuance of Mr. Harding. The truth of this statement you virtually deny. For you ask, how many of his friends were denied the privilege of voting, and how many of his enemies from other societies and a neighbouring state were allowed this privilege? Now what do you mean by these vile insinuations? Will you pretend that one *legal* voter was deprived of his right of suffrage? No. Will you pretend that one *illegal* voter was allowed to cast his vote into the ballot box? No. Will you pretend that Mr. Harding's dismission was *illegal*, or contrary to his *written contract*? No. Did not an ecclesiastical council, of which Dr. Holmes was moderator and Dr. Wisner scribe, sanction the dissolution of his connexion with the society? Yes. Why then do you throw out base innuendos, when you have no just cause of complaint?

Secondly. You also ask, how many hundreds, including *females*, petitioned to have Mr. Harding remain? And why did you not openly state the whole truth? I know that a petition was presented to the council; but how was it got up? How were the names obtained? Were there twenty males who signed the paper? How many of the females have uniformly attended the unitarian church? How many *hundreds*, including men, women, and children, with all the additions from other towns, *now* belong to the society? Do you wish for the whole truth on this subject? If so, declare your wish, and it shall be gratified.

Thirdly. I asserted that Mr. Harding left the church with five male members. This you do not deny; but you think I ought to have said the *whole* church. Very well. I say that all who had subscribed his human creed followed their leader. And I also say, that a larger number of men, who were already members of unitarian churches, and whose Christian characters the Reverend gentlemen himself will not dare to pronounce inferior to those of his own disciples, came forward to the communion, as soon as his unscriptural confession was fairly removed; and that one of this number was a member of an orthodox church, and had uniformly worshipped with the seceders, and was regarded by them as orthodox.

Fourthly. I asserted that the seceders took away the Bible which had been purchased by a subscription among the ladies. This you deny in the following words. "*They did not take it.* It was taken by the original purchasers, or *so many* of them as still resided in Waltham, whose property it was, and by them given to Mr. Harding's church subsequent to the separation." You have here committed as many errors, as your sentences contain ideas. I will therefore give you a brief account of the whole business. About the time the Second Society was organized, a subscription paper with the following caption was circulated among the ladies. "Being desirous to obtain a large

Bible and Hymn Book *for the desk*, and wishing all may have an opportunity of expressing their benevolence for the promotion of so laudable an object, it has been thought advisable to do it by subscription. We therefore, the undersigned, agree to pay for the above object the sums affixed to our names. Should more than is necessary be subscribed, the overplus shall be remitted to the Missionary Society." To this paper, ninety-four names were attached, and seven contributors withheld their signatures. The sum subscribed was thirty-three dollars and four cents. Now I wish to ask all people of common sense a few questions. Was not this money given for a specified object? Was not this object the purchase of a large Bible and Hymn Book? Were not these books *for the desk?* Had these contributors any control over this property, any more than over any benefactions to a Missionary Society? Suppose a hundred people subscribe a thousand dollars to purchase an organ *for the church.* Suppose it is placed in the church, and there used for years. Suppose a few of these donors should secede, would they have a right to carry away the organ? After I have given my money to any object, I have no further control over the donation. After I have specified the object to which my gift is appropriated, no one has a right to alter that designation. So in this case. The donors *gave* the Bible for *the desk.* And on that desk it should have remained unmolested, according to all the laws of man and God.

But during the week after the seceders had taken their leave of the church, one of the male members obtained the key of the meetinghouse from an apprentice of the sexton, and at the hour of dusk, *took the Bible from that desk* to which it had been originally destined. The proprietors of the church immediately made a noise about this proceeding, and the seceders circulated another paper with the following caption. "Whereas a division has taken place between the Second Church and the Second Religious Society in Waltham, we the subscribers who five years ago purchased a large Bible and Hymn Book *for the use of the desk*, as they were never formerly given to either church or society, but have been used by both together, do now give to the *Second Church* said Bible and Hymn Book, to be used by them wherever they may publicly worship God." This paper contains the names of but *twenty-seven* individuals; several of whom uniformly attended the unitarian meeting; one of whom was never presented with the paper nor her liberty asked to put down her name; and another of whom expressly forbid their writing her name on the paper. And above all, this twenty-seven did *not* include all who were then residents in Waltham. The amount of their contributions is *nine dollars* and eighty-seven cents. Now I leave it to yourself to say, if they had any lawful claim to this property.

For in the first place, had the original subscribers any right to the Bible after having given it for the use of the desk? Suppose the ladies should present five thousand dollars *to the Bunker-Hill Monument.* Suppose some five years hence they should choose to have the monument in some other place. Suppose a paper should be passed round with this caption. "We the subscribers who five years ago contributed five thousand dollars to the Bunker-Hill Monument, as the granite purchased with our money was never formally given either to the Association or to the Commonwealth, but has been used by both together, we do now give to the Commonwealth said granite, to be used by them wherever they may publicly erect a monument." Would these donors have a right to take their share of the property which had been invested in the work? The question is too absurd to require an answer. So I might ask if these seceders had any right whatever to remove property thus legally given for a specified purpose?

In the second place, the consent of only *one quarter* of the donors has as yet been obtained for the removal of the Bible. On this ground have the seceders any just claim to this property? Take an illustration. Suppose the ladies of a society purchase a silk gown *for the use of the minister.* Suppose one quarter of the subscribers should join another church, and unite with others in the support of another minister. Suppose their new pastor has no gown, and the society feel unable to procure one for his use. Suppose some twenty-five out of a hundred subscribers sign a paper of the kind above described, and send an agent to take the garment from the former minister's house. Would you call this Christian conduct? Can you then justify these twenty-five in thus taking the Bible? But this is not the worst of the case. For the Bible was first taken, and then the consent of the purchasers solicited. I know the paper is *dated* before the Bible was taken; but I can bring responsible witnesses to prove, that it was not presented to some of the subscribers, until after the property was taken, and a noise made about it by the lawful proprietors.

In the third place, these seceders have caught themselves in their own craftiness. For these twenty-five explicitly give the Bible to the *Second Church.* And in the name of common sense which church is the *Second?* That surely which belongs to the *Second Society.* This is fully proved by the public acts of the seceders themselves. For when their first legal meeting was notified, they did not call themselves the second church, but were designated by a very different name. They also published their creed; and on the title page of the pamphlet, styled themselves, "The Trinitarian Congregational Church in Waltham." Not only so. Mr. Harding signed a petition for a young man who wished to obtain the office of postmaster, and called himself the "Pastor of the Trinitarian Congregational Church." So that on their own ground, they have no right or title to the Bible. I trust

this plain statement of facts will establish the truth of my position and the falsity of yours.

Fifthly. I also asserted that the seceders carried off the communion *plate*, which had been given by an unitarian agent of the Manufacturing Company. You deny this statement in the following sentence: "They took their records and *their plate* for the very obvious reason, that they were their own property." I will give you the whole truth. About the time of the secession, Mr. Harding visited this unitarian agent, and assured him that "the church" would consult him about the disposition of this plate. The agent answered him nearly in these words: "If they consult me, I shall inform them very readily for whose use I intended the plate. I meant it for the church of the Second Society. You need not think to gain any advantage by your quibbles about church and congregation. I know no distinction, in a legal point of view, between church and congregation. *I meant the plate for whoever should wish to commune in the meetinghouse of the Second Society.*" This statement the agent made to distinguished individuals immediately after the interview. Of his own accord, he gave me the same account, within a very few weeks. I have no fear that any one will dare to deny the truth of this position. And it is evident to me that all the church do not feel easy as this business now stands; for some of them have repeatedly said that they were ready to pay back the money to this gentleman, whenever he should please to ask for it. Now on their own ground, they have no claim to the plate. For they claim the Bible according to the will of one quarter of the givers; but the will of the sole donor of the plate is disregarded. After knowing his feelings on the subject, they never found it convenient to consult him. I leave the public to make their own comments on this proceeding. The agent wished not for the paltry sum which he had given. He wished to have the laws of God and man obeyed. But rather than make any difficulty, he immediately furnished another set for the use of the Second Church.

The Second Society knew that this property was legally their own; but for the sake of *peace*, relinquished their rights; and at a parish meeting, soon after, passed the following resolution and vote: "Whereas certain seceders from the Second Church and Second Religious Society in Waltham, guided by a blind zeal, have taken from said church and society certain property belonging to said Second Church and Religious Society, *viz.* — one large Bible and certain sacramental vessels, the peculiar property of said second church and society, and thus committed violence upon the sacred rights and property of said church and society; and whereas the said church and society well know their legal rights, and feel, as they trust, a just sense of the outrage committed upon them; therefore resolved, that the Second Religious Society, desirous as much as in them lies of being at peace

with all men, deem it expedient to yield their legal rights an offering on the altar of peace.

"*March* 20, 1826."

Sixthly. I asserted that the orthodox church in this place consisted of ten male members. You answer, that I "might easily have known that this statement is not true." How so? One of my Society asked the aged deacon how many male members belonged to their church. He gave the names of *nine* individuals, which were written down at the time and brought to me. On looking over the list, I did not find the name of an Amherst student. I concluded the deacon had forgotten him, and accordingly called the number *ten.* I have since learned that this student is suspended from the church. I will therefore most cheerfully correct my mistake. There are *nine* male members, and *one* suspended member, residing in five or six different towns. *Letters*, p. 55. *Review*, pp. 32 — 51.

And now, Sir, what have you done, under this section, to weaken or destroy my conclusions?

IV. Measures for Organizing and Establishing Feeble Churches.

You have contradicted but very few of my statements under this section. Two only are deserving of the least notice.

1. Speaking of the means employed for the erection of the orthodox church in Billerica, I asserted that a hundred dollars was literally extorted from a single lady by over-persuasion. You contradict this statement in the following words: "This money, we are authorized to say, was brought to the house of Mr. Bennett, *unsolicited.*" Now the lady referred to was the late Miss Martha Bowers of Billerica. During her last sickness, she related all the circumstances of this affair to my brother, in presence of her youngest sister, an orthodox Christian of the strictest integrity and veracity. From him I received the fact at the time, and stated it on his authority. I therefore present you the following certificate in confirmation of my statement.

"In answer to the question addressed to her by me, whether she gave a hundred dollars towards the erection of the orthodox meetinghouse in Billerica, Miss Martha Bowers replied by the following statement. Said she, on the subscription paper which was circulated at the schoolhouse where the meeting was held, I put down one dollar. After meeting, Mr. Bennett, at my house, *urged* me to give something more. I told him, as I had for several years past appropriated the interest of a hundred dollars to the Foreign Missionary Society, he might take that interest. A while after, he called upon me, said he had conversed on this subject with the Andover gentlemen, who told him the friends of the cause in Billerica must do what they could in order to induce its friends abroad to exert themselves, and that he wished me to do something more than I had done. I replied,

that the hundred dollars which I had destined to some charitable purpose, he might take on one condition, *viz.* that he would not make the affair of this donation public. But, continued she, my feelings were soon hurt, by hearing that Mr. Bennett was proclaiming wherever he preached, that a certain woman in Billerica, worth five hundred dollars, had given one hundred dollars toward this object. Meeting him afterwards in Lexington, I told him my feelings had been injured by the course he had pursued. His answer was, that he thought it would do good, by exciting others to give. This statement was made to me on the sixth of last August, about three months before her death, and when she was laboring under that disorder which she was fully sensible would prove her last.

Billerica, March, 1831. NATHANIEL WHITMAN."

Now I leave it for the decision of the public, whether money thus given, was brought without *solicitation!* When you call to mind Mr. Bennett's manner of begging, and recollect that he called upon this lady *three times* for money; and especially, when you remember, that he was sent the third time by his *Andover employers*, you can have no doubt the money was literally extorted by over persuasion. The other witness of this conversation is now in New Jersey. She is a person of orthodox sentiments, well known to Dr. Fay of Charlestown, and knows nothing of my present publication. I give you full liberty to derive all possible advantage from her testimony; but I will risk my life that she will confirm every material fact of this certificate, and consequently establish the literal truth of my position. *Letters*, p. 59. *Review*, p. 52.

2. Speaking of the means adopted for the support of feeble societies, I asserted that an appeal was made to the Domestic Missionary Society. Your answer to this statement is contained in the following half of a sentence: "There is no Domestic Missionary Society in Massachusetts." And in your first *notice* of my Letters, you declared this society had *no existence.* Now if you have spoken the truth, it is high time for the community to be on their guard against imposition. For I have before me a letter from the Rev. Mr. Blanchard, the orthodox minister of Lowell, in relation to the trust-deed of Billerica church. It appeared in the Lowell Journal before the appearance of my Letters, and was copied into the Recorder after their publication. The following statements are taken from this document. "Early in the last Spring, as soon as the business could be conveniently transacted, an instrument was constructed and executed, conveying the property in question to trustees, to be held by them for the use of the orthodox church in Billerica on certain conditions; upon a forfeiture of which, the property reverts not to Mr. Bennett or his heirs, but to the MASSACHUSETTS DOMESTIC MISSIONARY SOCIETY." And soon after you find these words: "For the truth of these facts I give my

name as one of the Trustees. And if this be not enough, the trust-deed itself can easily be investigated, one copy of which is in the possession of the Trustees, and another is lodged with the secretary of the DOMESTIC MISSIONARY SOCIETY." Now if there is no such society, Mr. Blanchard and others are grossly deceiving the public, and they cannot be watched too closely. If there be such a society, my statement is true. *Letters*, p. 63. *Review*, p. 52.

Besides the particulars which I have noticed, you say there are other misstatements under this division. Why could you not name them? For instance, why did you not simply aver that my account of the organization of feeble churches was incorrect? You *dared* not make such an assertion. You knew I should expose many more of your unjustifiable measures. I wish a full statement of the facts might be given, in relation to the establishment of feeble societies, in such places as Billerica, Brighton, Canton, Cohasset, Concord. I think the eyes of the public would be opened by such a disclosure. And now, sir, what have you done under this head to weaken or destroy my conclusions?

V. DENUNCIATIONS.

You have contradicted six of my statements under this section. Your assertions are all mere quibbles. I will notice the most important, as a fair specimen of the whole.

I gave you an extract from an extemporaneous discourse by the Rev. Mr. Green. You admit that he uttered the uncharitable and unchristian sentiments, but pronounce some of the circumstances of the narration incorrect. I cheerfully correct all the mistakes according to your wishes. I called it a *discourse*, when I should have said *address*. I called it a *lecture*, when I should have said *meeting*. I called it *evening*, when I should have said *afternoon*. I said the audience was composed *principally* of *females*, when I should have admitted that there were as manay as *thirty males* to *two hundred* females. But this does not alter the character of the denunciation, which must for ever remain a disgrace to its author. I would merely ask him to meditate on the following words of the pious Baxter. "Really speak thy heart, man; wouldst thou have God less merciful than he is? Or wouldst thou wish him to be so little merciful as to damn all that be not of thy opinion, or to unchristen and unchurch all those that thou speakest against? or wouldst thou have him to condemn and cast away all men that have as great *faults*, as the *errors* of these Christians are? And consequently to condemn thyself?" *Letters*, p. 79. *Review*, p. 53. *Baxter*, Vol. IV. p. 165.

What have you done to weaken or destroy my conclusions under this section?

VI. MISCELLANEOUS FACTS.

You have contradicted several of my statements under this section. I will notice all your assertions which relate to positions of the least importance. Your numerous quibbles merely prove the weakness of your cause.

1. *Education Society. First.* I asserted that funds had been given to this society by unitarians with the *express understanding*, that indigent students of their own sentiments should be assisted. The truth of this statement you deny outright. In proof of my position I will refer you to three different sources of evidence. In the first place, look at the absurdity of your denial. Can you suppose intelligent unitarians would give money to educate ministers, who would not acknowledge their benefactors to be Christians? — who would break up the harmony of families, neighbourhoods, and parishes? — and who would denounce them as heretcis, infidels, deists, devils? No; you are not so credulous as all this. You must admit that the unitarian donors at least *expected* that young men of their own sentiments would be aided by their benefactions. In the second place, do not the donors themselves *know* with what views their gifts were bestowed? Can you find one who will say that he had no expectation unitarian students would be assisted? No, sir; I have not been able to find such an individual; and on the other hand, I can present you scores of certificates in proof of my assertion. I will give you one from my brother, as he took a deep interest in the society at a former period, and as Mr. Bennett has declared there was but one Christain in his town at that time.

"Believing the American Education Society would realize its profession of being a liberal and catholic society, I early and warmly recommended its objects to the serious attention of my people from the pulpit. Some of the ladies of my society, under the influence of similar views and feelings, at length united their contributions to make me a life member of it. Had they believed, that it was to be a society of a sectarian or exclusive character, their contributions would have been withheld. We expressly understood that pious young men of our religious views and sentiments would receive the pecuniary aid of the society upon proper recommendation. NATHANIEL WHITMAN.

"*Billerica, March*, 1831."

In the third place, look at the *promises* of your agents. The late Rev. Dr. Pearson was one of the principal founders of this society, and one of its earliest agents. He stated explicitly that there was to be nothing exclusive or sectarian in the reception of beneficiaries; and that pious young men of all denominations would be assisted. During a visit to a unitarian society, he urged the leading members to come forward and organize an auxiliary. A distinguished unitarian told him plainly, that he *feared* the result; that he believed *him* to be

honest and sincere in his intentions and declarations; but that he *suspected* certain leaders were making an instrument of him to accomplish party purposes, and would not fufil his promises. The Doctor could not *then* believe the statement, but he lived long enough to see this suspicion literally verified. If you wish for certificates to this effect, they shall be forthcoming. I think therefore, that it is proved most clearly, that unitarians gave funds to the Education Society on the *express understanding* that pious young men of their own sentiments should be received as beneficiaries. *Letters*, p. 81. *Review*, p. 33–53.

Secondly. I asserted that if a beneficiary of the Education Society wishes to receive his collegiate education at Cambridge, every possible exertion is made to *frighten* him from such a course. You affirm that my statement is not true, and that you never *frighten* any one from going to Cambridge. But you admit, that you *advise* them not to enter that heretical institution. Now what you mean by *advice* I understand by *frighten*; and you would probably aver, that orthodox preachers never *frighten* their hearers, but merely *advise* them to keep out of hell; although not a few are *advised* out of their senses. I will however proceed to show, that you actually use all possible exertions to *frighten* students from going to Harvard College. I appeal to two sources of evidence. In the first place, the testimony of living witnesses. Almost the first minister I met, after reading your Review, was fitted for college at Andover. I pointed out your quibble about the word *frighten*. He made this observation. I do not vouch for the language, but only for the ideas. "I recollect perfectly well, that the orthodox did all in their power to frighten me from going to Cambridge. They assured me that the colleges would doubtless be sunk within four years. They declared that President Kirkland was not a Christain; no, not even a *moral* man. And so strong an impression did they make on my mind, that I should have gone to *Yale College*, had not my friends interfered and prevented!" I have no doubt, Sir, that I can present you with a hundred certificates of a similar character. As yet I have applied to no individual; but I now call upon all, whom the orthodox have endeavoured to frighten from entering at Cambridge, to furnish me with an accurate statement of the means and language used to effect their purpose.

In the second place, I present you more tangible evidence. An article appeared in your own Journal with this title: "Shall I send my son to Harvard College?" This was afterwards struck off in the form of a tract, and is given to all who think of obtaining their collegiate education at Cambridge, whether beneficiaries or otherwise. Take the following sentences from this slanderous publication, as a fair specimen of the whole. "Shall I advise you, then, to place your son, the child of your prayers and fondest hopes, whom you early dedicated to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and whom you are endeavouring to

prepare for usefulness in the kingdom of Christ — shall I advise you to place him, during the four most critical years of his existence, at this unitarian institution? No, my dear Sir, I cannot do it; and for the following reasons. In the first place, you have *no right* to place your child in a scene of such *extreme* moral and spiritual danger. He would soon find, that he must break loose from some of the restraints of his education, must visit his closet *less* frequently, keep the sabbath less strictly, lay aside his devotional books, and regard the institutions of religion with less seriousness and reverence, or he *must become*, at least to many, an object of *suspicion*, if not of *scorn*. The *most able* description can convey but a *very* imperfect impression of the *thousand* influences which are there brought to bear upon the heart of every student, to chill his piety, to weaken the hold which the great truths of the Gospel may have had upon him, to induce him to look upon the Scriptures, except in name, with a *skeptical* mind, and some portions of them with a *sneering infidelity*. Since 1805, the time of the election of Dr. Ware to the professorship of divinity, *few* young men, even of the most devout and faithful parents, have been able to *recover* from the *shock* which their early religious education there sustained; a *melancholy* interval, when surveyed in its results by the eye of *Christian* benevolence, during which unitarianism has *ingulphed* in its *dark* flood *nearly all* the sons of Harvard. This I consider myself bound to testify before the world, that the *influence* there exerted against *sound* religious sentiments and *vital* godliness, is like a *sweeping flood;* to the unfortified minds of youth it is RESISTLESS."* Such is a mere specimen of your *advisatory* language to orthodox parents and orthodox students. If these statements are not *designed* to *frighten* young men from entering Harvard College, then I confess I know not the meaning of language. I think no one will accuse me of making an ungrounded assertion on this subject. *Letters*, p. 81. *Review*, pp. 34 — 53.

2. *Geneseo School.* I gave some account of orthodox measures in Geneseo, in relation to three young men from Cambridge. You have denied the truth of several of my statements, and published an extract from an anonymous letter in proof of your assertions. I sent the Review to Mr. Felton, who was the principal of that School, and who is now a tutor in Harvard University. I proposed a number of questions, which he has answered, and which I now publish with his name. To all, by whom this gentleman is known, his letter will be a satisfactory refutation of all your anonymous declarations; and if his word and reasoning and evidence are not sufficient to satisfy *you*, call for further proof, and it shall be forthcoming.

"Dear Sir,

"Your questions in relation to the School in Geneseo, with which I was connected, and of which you gave some account in your Letters to Professor Stuart, I will briefly answer.

"1. The Reviewer asserts, in contradiction to your statement, that 'the *simple* circumstance that the three young men received their degrees at Cambridge was *not* sufficient to arouse the enmity of the orthodox leaders'; and that it 'was well understood that two of these young men were unitarians, and respecting the third many were not satisfied.' You ask if these assertions are true? I answer, they are utterly false, come from whom they will. The opposition to the school was started by the Rev. Mr. Bull, of the Presbyterian church, and his coadjutor, Mr. John Colt, the moment the suggestion was made to employ instructers from Harvard University, and before any *individual* had been engaged or even spoken to on the subject. These and other gentlemen of the same sect had formed the design of making the school strictly Presbyterian, and of subjecting it entirely to their own control. Any arrangement by which that object would be defeated, was sure of meeting a strenuous opposition. The unitarianism of Harvard University was an excellent alarm-cry to rouse the vulgar prejudices of a community who had few if any means of knowing the truth. It was used as such; and used with a reckless disregard to the principles of honor, to say nothing of religion, which the heat of sectarian zeal, and the blindness of bigotry, can scarcely palliate, and never excuse. As to the second assertion, in regard to 'understanding and dissatisfaction' concerning the personal sentiments of the instructers who were finally employed, I will merely say, it is true so far as the misrepresentations of Mr. Bull and his instruments made it so. The fears and suspicions of a large body of men had been roused by the statements circulated by the Rev. gentleman and his associates, at the very time when he had in his pocket clear proofs, from an authority which he never affected to disbelieve, that his statements *were false* and utterly so. In this way, and in no other way, is the least sentence of the Review under this head *true*.

"2. The Review asserts, that 'the minister of the place *did not* draw up the memorial.' You ask if this is true? The memorial was drawn up either by Mr. Bull or by one of his confidential advisers, and submitted to him for correction and approbation. If Mr. Bull's agency had not been exerted, that paper never would have seen the light. It went forth, sanctioned by the name, and supported by the ministerial influence of Mr. Bull, and was, to all intents and purposes, his production, though he may not have penned the whole of it. This statement, neither the Reverend gentleman nor any of his friends will affect to deny. What then becomes of the Reviewer's pretended disclaimer?

"I pass now to the letter, quoted in the Appendix, to which you have requested my attention.

"1. I shall consider the Rev. Mr. Bull as the author of this letter. It bears every internal evidence of having come from his pen. The paltry cant, and the Jesuitical falsehood, that run through the production,

mark it unerringly as *his*. Besides, among the Presbyterians of Geneseo, he is the only individual capable of constructing two paragraphs with so much artifice and misrepresentation ingeniously combined. The first paragraph in reference to the memorials is as follows.

"'These memorials were returned the day of the annual meeting of the stockholders, and were handed to a gentleman of this village to be copied. Supposing the memorial to be the same in all the towns, and being pressed for time, he did not take the precaution to read them, and attached all the names to one copy, and among the rest, the signatures to the Lima memorial. This mistake was not discovered till the memorial was read before the stockholders; nor am I now certain whether it was then observed. The transfer was made by a gentleman of unblemished character, and unquestionable integrity, and the error occurred in a way capable of an easy and satisfactory explanation.' You ask if this is true.

"The memorial, as it was originally drafted, and finally presented to the stockholders, declared emphatically, that the *three* young men were deeply imbued with, and highly in favor of, unitarian sentiments. The mode by which the Presbyterian enemies of the school proposed to accomplish their object (viz. the election of a new Board of Trustees, and the *nullification* of the contract, which the former board made with us,) was to create a general alarm in the community, by fastening on the minds of the people the belief, that our school would be decidedly sectarian and unitarian. To this end, it was necessary to make it appear that *all three* of the teachers were deeply imbued with, and highly in favor of unitarian sentiments. It so happened, however, that objections *were* made, although the Reviewer denies the fact, to the falsehood contained in the memorial. It so happened, that another memorial, substituting the word *two* in the place of *three*, was issued from the Presbyterian conclave, to obviate so reasonable and natural an objection. It so happened, that a number of men, the Reviewer says twenty-six, signed the second form of the memorial, which differed from the first in an essential particular, and that these names were presented to the stockholders with the rest. Let me ask, Was not the circulation of a memorial, containing a gross falsehood, which Mr. Bull knew to be such, a 'gross deception'? And was not the falsehood just such an one, as an unprincipled man would invent, who wished to raise a storm of vulgar obloquy against those whom his interest or his passions might urge him to ruin? But Mr. Bull says it happened by *accident*, and that 'this mistake was not discovered till the memorial was read before the stockholders, and that he is not certain, whether it was then observed.' Let me ask again, How is it possible that the author or authors of *two* documents, so exceedingly different, could have presented *one* with *all* the names, and not observed the mistake, if it happened by mistake? Supposing the names *had* been accident-

ally attached to *one* memorial, it is rather curious, that they should have been taken by accident *from* the memorial which was of no use to them, and attached, *by accident*, to the only one which answered their purpose. It is still more curious, that gentlemen who had penned the different documents, and were, of course, fully aware of their existence, should, *by mere accident*, suddenly forget the second at the very moment when the mention of it might have altered the impression they intended to produce. But the most curious thing of all is, that Mr. Bull, a minister of the Gospel, should have *heard* a memorial against *three* men, denouncing them in the strongest language as unitarians, *and by the merest accident in the world*, have forgot that he had in his pocket two letters from an orthodox gentleman, one of which he had taken from the office that very morning, proving most conclusively to any body's mind, the falsehood on which the memorial was founded.

"Mr. Bull says, 'The transfer was made by a gentleman of unblemished character and unquestionable integrity.' On this I will only remark, that it was strongly believed, that this gentleman *knew* the difference between the memorials. If he did not, why was he not informed by his master, *who did?* I will merely add, that many of the most intelligent signers of *both* memorials were so much disgusted with these proceedings, that they indignantly withdrew, and some became afterwards friends and supporters of the school.

"'It is not a matter of regret to me,' continues Mr. Bull, 'that this subject is brought before the public. On the contrary, I am heartily glad that an opportunity is afforded of correcting the misrepresentations, and confuting the slanders, which, I have reason to suppose, have been freely and extensively circulated, to the prejudice of religion, among a certain class of people in your section of the country; and I shall be pleased to furnish you with any further detail of facts relating to this school, which, in your opinion, the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom may render consistent and proper to be spread before the public. Indeed, I have long been waiting and wishing for a call in Providence to give the full history of this school publicity." The vanity displayed in these sentences is amusing, but the cant is disgusting. 'The interests of the Redeemer's kingdom,' in the same sentence with Mr. Bull's detail of facts relating to the Geneseo school! A call of Providence on the Rev. Mr. Bull to give a full history of a public school, which, during two years, this same Mr. Bull moved heaven and earth to destroy! Mr. Bull will *never* publish a history of that school; he *dares* not. But this history *has been written*, and would have been published in Geneseo two years since, had not the writer yielded to the advice of others, and, for the sake of peace, suppressed it.

"2. Mr. Bull continues, 'I am persuaded a detail of all the facts in the case would show most clearly the disingenuity, management, and

insidious arts of unitarianism. It will be sufficient, however, to say, at present, that the school entirely failed under the care of the three young men from Harvard; and at the end of the two years for which they were employed, they left it almost without scholars, without reputation in the community, and without credit to themselves.' You ask if this is true. What 'detail of facts' Mr. Bull alludes to, I am utterly at a loss to conjecture. I can only say that no 'detail of facts' connected with our school, can show *any thing* about unitarianism, for the simple reason that unitarianism never was remotely or immediately, directly or indirectly concerned in it. Any proposition from *any* sect, to introduce *any* sectarian doctrines into the instruction given in our school, would have been promptly rejected. It was an institution designed simply to promote the cause of popular education, without the slightest reference to *any* party or *any* subjects; and though Mr. Bull and his knot of Presbyterians had within their reach every possible proof of this, they did not hesitate to denounce us fervently and constantly, as being engaged in a nefarious plot 'to strike at the root of the faith as held by *all* the *Christian* denominations in the country!'

"'But,' continues Mr. Bull, 'the school entirely failed.' It is true, our success was far from meeting our expectations. The plan of the school was to place the tuition very low, in order that the working classes might enjoy its benefits; and it is obvious that a school of this description can be supported only by a pretty large number. We expected and probably should have had two hundred, had the prejudices of the community never been excited against us. But it is *not* true that the school 'entirely failed.' Until our last quarter, we never had less than sixty, except at the opening of the school. Both winters our numbers ranged from one hundred to one hundred and forty, and we closed our last quarter with *about a half a dozen more pupils* than our successor has *ever* had, until his late winter term, which has just expired. This fact varies slightly from Mr. Bull's statement, which I shall presently refer to. As to our 'reputation in the community,' it is not for me to speak. I will simply say, that the most respectable and intelligent gentlemen in that region were our warm friends and supporters. As little does it become the Rev. Mr. Bull to fix the measure of *any* man's reputation in that community. A man who confines his intercourse to a few members of a particular sect, in a remote village, and who looks upon the 'charities of social life' with the evil eye of a morose ascetic, has but slender pretensions to the right of passing judgment upon other men's 'reputation in the community.' Mr. Bull rejected all invitations to visit us or our school. The only intercourse he ever had with any person immediately connected with our establishment, was in attempting to persuade the lady who had charge of the boarding-house, and who was a member of his church, to leave it, and thus embarrass our proceedings. He never crossed the thres-

hold of our school; nor did any of his associates. At the end of every term the school was subjected to a public examination of several days, which was numerously attended by gentlemen in the vicinity, by teachers from Rochester and Canandaigua and other places, and by the intelligent board of Trustees. The Rev. Mr. Bayard, of the Episcopal church, an accomplished man and elegant scholar, was a constant attendant. To the statements of this gentleman, made verbally, and in the columns of the 'Livingston Journal,' and to the votes of the Trustees, and to the accounts given by others, in various papers of that region, I think more authority may justly be attached, than to the representations of our bitterest enemy, who knew personally nothing at all about the school, and who carried his bitterness from the intercourse of every-day life, to the pulpit; making the sacred services of the sabbath an occasion to poison the minds of his hearers with prejudices originating in bigotry and supported by untruths. The Rev. Mr. Bayard and the clergyman of the methodist church permitted their sons to remain under our care until the last day of our residence in Geneseo. Rather a singular commentary upon the plot 'to strike at the root of the faith of *all Christians*.'

3. "'It has since,' continues the letter, 'been put under the care of a gentleman of correct principles and excellent qualifications, who has daily communicated instruction in the great truths of the gospel, under whom it has acquired reputation, risen to a respectable standing, and regained the confidence of the Christian community. There is at present something of a revival of religion in the school.' You ask if this is true. I have no doubt of the excellent character and qualifications of this gentleman, and of his judicious management of the school. Mr. Bull, however, would intimate that until his time 'the great truths of the gospel' were never taught there. My only reply to this is, if 'the great truths of the gospel' are taught in the Bible, we taught them, though we did it without reference to Presbyterianism, or any other sectarian interpretation. If 'the great truths of the Gospel' are not taught in the Bible, but in catechisms and creeds of man's framing, I am free to confess that they were not imposed upon our pupils. On the enormity of this crime, perhaps the decision of the public will vary from that of the Rev. Norris Bull, and his friend Mr. John Colt. Our successor is represented as having 'raised the school to a respectable standing, and regained the confidence of the Christian community' — meaning that *we* had neither. I have already mentioned the comparative numbers of our pupils; to that statement I will barely add one sentence from a letter, dated March 4, written by an intelligent young man, who was living at the boarding-house of the school, to a friend of his in this vicinity, without the slightest reference to the present subject. It is this. 'Mr. B. [the instructer] leaves the High School the twelfth of this month, *and it is generally*

supposed it will go down.' I have not yet heard whether it has 'gone down' or not, but the number of pupils, the greatest number since we left the school, last winter, was about forty.

"If Mr. Bull were known in this community, I should never condescend to deny any statement he might please to make. The publication of his letter at the distance of five hundred miles from Geneseo and without his name, and its circulation among a class of people in this neighbourhood, who may possibly believe it, give it an importance altogether independent of the author, for whom I can have no other feelings than a contemptuous pity.

"Yours, with respect, C. C. FELTON.

"*Cambridge, April*, 1831."

Letters, p. 87. *Review*, pp. 54 – 82.

3. *Convention of Congregational Ministers.* Speaking of the attempt of the exclusionists to drive unitarians from the Convention, I asserted, that the whole business had been planned with intended *secrecy* in the Park-street vestry. You affirm that the meetings in which these measures were discussed, "were *public*, and *publicly* notified." Yes, my dear Sir, and how was this *public* notice given? After those who were to conduct the prayers had assembled in the pulpit, it was discovered that a liberal minister was in the congregation. How to give their notice so as to exclude him, they knew not. After much consultation and whispering, the notice was communicated somewhat in this form. "All who have been *desired*, are *requested* to assemble in the vestry."

I also asserted that a committee previously selected was chosen. You say this is manifestly untrue. Sir, do you not recollect that the list selected happened to fall into unitarian hands; that a unitarian minister arose and held up the paper containing the names; that he begged to have the whole number read at once to save time; that there was a great blushing and cringing among certain orthodox gentlemen, and that after all this, an attempt was made to deviate from the candidates previously selected?

But this is not all. Since you attempt to make your readers believe that I have no acquaintance with the *secret* plottings which have been carried on in Park vestry, for the destruction of unitarianism, I will give you one more statement. Sir, were you present when a question of this nature was discussed; What must be done to promote the cause of religion, or orthodoxy? And do you recollect that the three following propositions were definitely stated? 'First, we must cease controversy, for the unitarians gain the advantage. Secondly, we must use all possible exertions to produce revivals. And thirdly, we must especially endeavour to secure the influence of the women.' You may wonder how I should come by this information. To satisfy you that I have no special communication with his Satanic majesty, I will simply

observe, that honest, candid, orthodox men were present on that occasion. They were disgusted with such proposals. They lost their confidence in the honesty of the leaders. They told of these things to others less orthodox in sentiment, who now feel under a necessity of exposing some of your secret machinations. I will only add, that you had better be careful how you deny the truth of my positions respecting the meetings in Park street vestry, unless you wish some most singular measures brought to light.

I likewise asserted that Dr. Woods wrote the Rev. Mr. Stearns a dictatorial letter. This you deny. I give you my authority in the following certificate.

"Conversing with me at his own house concerning ecclesiastical affairs, some time in the course of the year, in which was chosen the famous committee of convention, to define the character of a Christian church, of which Dr. Woods was chairman, the Rev. Mr. Stearns alluded to that subject in the following manner. 'I was not in convention when I was chosen one of that committee; nor shall I act as a member of it, *for it is party business.* They have had one meeting, of which Dr. Woods gave me notice, but I did not attend. He has notified me of a second meeting, and *reproved* me for not interesting myself in this business; but I shall not attend, and have returned a pretty plain reply to his letter.

"*Billerica, April.* NATHANIEL WHITMAN."

4. *Andover Theological Seminary. First.* You insinuate that my evidence in the case of James Kimball was derived from an *ex parte* source. In this you are altogether mistaken. Why did you not deny the truth of some of my positions? Why did you not challenge me to prove the correctness of my statements? Sir, you *dared* not do it. You probably learned enough of this case of persecution, to know that if all the documents now existing on this question were presented to the public, a most tremendous excitement would be produced. You probably learnt, that Kimball himself died in the belief of most of the orthodox doctrines, and that an abundance of orthodox authority could be called in support of my facts. You probably learnt, that I had not even stated the two most aggravated circumstances in the business; and that if you denied a single insinuation of mine, the whole affair would be brought before the people. You would much better have said nothing upon this subject, for what you have said, only seems to confirm the truth of my statement in the estimation of your own party. Sir, you *dare* not deny the correctness of my positions respecting James Kimball; *you*, who are so lavish of your assertions on all other topics. *Review*, p. 26. *Letters*, p. 92.

Secondly. You assert that I have as little *knowledge* of Dr. Murdock's case as I have business with it. How much business I have with a history of his persecutions, the public must determine. But as to my

knowledge on this subject, perhaps I can convince you of its accuracy and extent. I will therefore give a very meagre outline of a very complicated and important transaction. The circumstances are briefly these. The Theological Institution at Andover proved to be in a most wretched condition. This its friends openly said and probably believed. And what was to be done for its regeneration? The Trustees appointed a committee to visit and examine the Professors and students. Dr. Murdock was the first professor called upon, and he made a very full statement of his views and sentiments, supposing he had the entire confidence of the committee. What he said was taken down in writing; and a long, very long, report was made. On this report the charges against Dr. Murdock were founded, and principally on his own declarations. The Trustees voted to dissolve his connexion with the institution, and refused to allow him a hearing *with counsel;* and even forbid his seeing the Report of the committee. He did not appear before the Trustees, but protested against their proceeding. They deprived him of his office. He appealed to the Board of Visitors. They had a long trial with closed doors, and confirmed the decision of the Trustees. He appealed to the Supreme Court, who confirmed the decision of the Visitors, thinking their power limited to the inquiry —Whether the Visitors had exceeded their jurisdiction; and *not* whether he had been fairly tried and justly condemned.

And what were the charges against Dr. Murdock? There were eight; four made from his own statements, and four from other sources. I have not room for the whole; but I will give a few extracts for the peculiar benefit of the people. Charge I. "There are in Dr. Murdock's mind, jealousies of the other members of the Faculty and of the Trustees, and a want of confidence in his colleagues and in the Trustees, out of which evils necessarily grow, tending to the material injury, if not the prostration, of the government of the institution. There are, in his mind, jealousies of the *other members of the Faculty*, and a want of confidence in them, as stated by himself to the Committee of Inquiry. He now 'has the impression,' he states, 'and has had it nearly ever since he came here, that he was brought here, by those who were active in getting him here, to be an understrapper to them; that one of his colleagues [Dr. Woods] wished him, Dr. Murdock, to help him, to hold his own against another of his colleagues, [Mr. Stuart]; 'and the latter colleague against the former! One of his colleagues [Dr. Porter] Dr. Murdock stated, he regards as 'a gentlemanly, honest, upright man,' but as having 'yielded the helm of his mind to another of his colleagues [Dr. Woods]. That other, he is deliberately of opinion, is 'really pious, and more than ordinarily so, but maintains, theoretically and practically, such a view of the nature of virtue, as leads him to make the accomplishment of his own purposes and plans, at whatever expense to others, consistent with his conscience

and the highest good; as carried, by his principles, to make it consistent, at least with *his* conscience, to follow his own prejudices, in opposition to very plain rules of justice and honest dealing'; as will lead him to 'sacrifice any friend who stands in the way of his designs, and *that* from what he regards as benevolent motives.' His remaining colleague [Mr. Stuart] Dr. Murdock has stated, he regards as 'having true religion in his soul, and commonly open, ingenuous, and honorable; but at times, crafty; always ambitious and vain; and generally, having a supreme regard to himself; often headlong in his movements, rushing *per fas aut nefas*.'" On this charge, I would merely remark, that many individuals in our community will doubtless be surprised to find the opinion of Dr. Murdock, formed after a long and intimate connexion, so perfectly accordant with their own respecting these gentlemen.

Take a part of the third charge, as a curious specimen of the religious liberty enjoyed at Andover Institution, These are the words. "III. Dr. Murdock entertains views respecting the course of conduct proper for an officer in this Institution, and has in consequence of these views, pursued a course of conduct, in several particulars, wholly inconsistent with the *real* interests of this Seminary. He has stated, *that he thinks it proper to discuss, with the students, subjects belonging to the departments of his colleagues; and in such discussions, to impugn the arguments which his colleagues have advanced,* AND THAT HE HAS DONE THIS!" Well, this is religious liberty with a vengeance. Suppose Dr. Ware should be dismissed, because he thought proper to attack the arguments by which Professor Norton defended some proposition on which they happened to differ? I consider this simple quotation as the best possible commentary on Professor Stuart's Letter to Dr. Channing; and more than an set-off for all his impassioned declamation.

Take the third charge, made from other sources. These are the words: "Dr. Murdock's jealousy of his colleagues and of the trustees, and his representations to resident licentiates and students, respecting the character and conduct of his colleagues, the proceedings of the faculty, the character of *some* of the laws, the proceedings of the trustees, have, in *fact*, had a very injurious influence upon the members of the seminary." Now those of us, who know that most of the students were in favor of Dr. Murdock, are unable to understand this statement. I have room for no further quotations. Let me then sum up my positions. Did not the Trustees make the honest statements of Dr. Murdock, obtained under most peculiar circumstances, the foundation of the charges or indictment against him? Did they not vote that it was expedient his connexion with the seminary should be dissolved, *before* they gave him any notice of the charges against him? Did they not refuse to allow him the aid of counsel in his defence? Was not the burden of proof thrown upon him, instead of the Trustees

undertaking to *prove* his guilt? Did they not refuse him access to the records and papers necessary to his defence? And especially, did they not refuse him the evidence which they had received against him without his knowledge, and upon which they had made their charges and passed the vote of dissolution? Did not the visitors refuse to grant him an open trial and proceed with closed doors, allowing only one witness to be present at a time? Did it not appear at that trial, that Professor Stuart had written a most remarkable letter to the conductors of "The Christian Spectator," censuring with great severity the course they had taken as to the controversy on the Atonement, and their respectful notice of Dr. Murdock's Discourse on that subject, and threatening to set up an opposition Review? And have not the visitors withheld from Dr. Murdock his copy of that letter, and all his original papers given in evidence? Has not Dr. Murdock repeatedly demanded them; and has he not been prevented by this unjustifiable detention of the visitors from making a public statement of his case? *Letters*, p. 93. *Review*, p. 26.

6. *Misrepresentation.* I gave a long list of most unjustifiable orthodox misrepresentations. Your answer to the whole is contained in the following sentence. "If a single, well authenticated instance could be produced, we should regret and condemn it as sincerely as our author." Sir, did I not pledge myself to *prove* the truth of every statement I made? Did I not charge "one instance" on the orthodox minister of this place? Has he not ascertained that the whole story was without the least foundation in truth? Why has he not had the honesty to confess his mistake, especially since he has had so much to do in providing materials for your Review? Sir, if you will condemn every well authenticated instance of orthodox misrepresentation, I will furnish you with one hundred of the most aggravated character. I will now give you one of late occurrence, and if you fulfil your promise, the ninety and nine shall be forthcoming. About three months since, a unitarian lady in this place was rapidly failing with the consumption. She was sustained by her religious views to a most remarkable degree; being rendered uncommonly resigned, joyful, and happy. Members of the orthodox church made themselves very busy for one or two days, in circulating the report, that this lady had become orthodox, that she had met with a change, that she could not die a unitarian; a report, utterly and thoroughly false, without the least shadow of truth for a foundation. Nothing, but a most urgent sense of duty could possibly have induced me to refer to this aggravated instance of slander. But, Sir, I firmly believe, that when unitarians are wonderfully supported by their Christian faith, a systematic effort is made by certain orthodox professors to misrepresent such instances, and that stories are forged, without the least regard to truth, for the purpose of effecting this object. The reasons of this belief I am ready to give, either from the press, or

before any court of justice. And the only palliation I can find for this unprincipled measure is contained in the following passage from the pious Baxter. "And abundance of sincere godly persons, especially women, have loose tongues, and hasty passions, and a stretching conscience, but especially injudicious heads, so that frequently they know not truth from falsehood, nor have the tenderness of conscience to be silent till they know; so that if one say it, another will say it, till a hundred say it, and then it goeth for current truth." *Letters*, p. 94. *Review*, p. 42. *Baxter*, vol. IV. p. 533.

Thus have I noticed your remarks on my First Letter. And what have you done to weaken or destroy my conclusions? Did not the "Recorder" assure us that a "thorough Review" would be given to the public? Did he not inform us that it would take some considerable time to collect the necessary evidence for this purpose? Have not several individuals aided in your great undertaking? Is it to be supposed that you have omitted any thing which would have the least effect on my statements? Have you not aimed to do all in your power to cast discredit on my facts? And after all this mountain labor, what have you accomplished? Have I not fairly noticed all your assertions of the least importance, all your arguments, and all your evidence? Have I not defended every essential position with satisfactory proof? Have I not shown most conclusively that all the important statements of my First Letter are substantially correct? You have said, that most of the measures described in my First Letter are the natural and inevitable result of your principles, "*bating the false coloring and inaccuracies of statement.*" How much false coloring have you *proved*? How many inaccuracies have you *established*?

I must, therefore, let the public see what are the necessary results of your own principles. Your honest admission I must hold up for the inspection of the community. Here are your very words.

"*The attentive reader will perceive, in view of the foregoing remarks, that* NO SMALL *part of what Mr. Whitman charges upon the orthodox as* PERSECUTION *and* OPPRESSION, *and altogether inconsistent with free inquiry and religious liberty, is but the* NECESSARY RESULT *of* THEIR *religious liberty. They could not have their liberty and do otherwise. They certainly have the right, as much so as Mr. Whitman or any other man, to adopt their own religious principles, and to act according to them; and it will be found on examination that* MOST *of the charges urged against them in his* FIRST *Letter (bating the false coloring and inaccuracies of statement) are the* NATURAL AND INEVITABLE RESULT OF THEIR HONEST PRINCIPLES."

Very well! Out at last! This is what I have always thought. Let any man read over attentively my First Letter to Professor Stuart, if he wishes to know what the organ of the exclusionists acknowledges to be the natural result of their religious liberty and religious principles.

I call upon the community, I call upon every boy and girl, upon every man and woman, to remember this confession. I call upon the freemen of this nation to banish those views of liberty and religion which lead necessarily to such unchristian measures and abominable practices. I call upon them to ascertain if the religion of Jesus sanctions or even tolerates such conduct.

LETTER II.

REVEREND SIR,

I proceed to notice your remarks on my Second Letter to Professor Stuart. I hope you, and your adherents, will accompany me in this examination. I shall be as brief as the nature of the controversy will permit.

I. REFORMERS.

Most of your remarks on my statements under this section, are either mere quibbles, or relate to questions of no consequence to our controversy. But two of your assertions seem to me worthy of an answer.

1. Speaking of the religious sentiments of Zuingle, I asserted that "his views were exceedingly liberal, not differing *essentially*, except in one or two points, from the *liberal* Christians of the present period." You attempt to show the incorrectness of my statement, by a quotation from Mosheim. Your extract is greatly garbled, and also made from an unfaithful translation. You wish to make your readers believe that Luther was perfectly satisfied with the sentiments of Zuingle, except in one or two particulars. I will prove that your assertion is not true, by several quotations from these Reformers themselves, and also from their friends and followers. My first extract will convince you that Luther was a determined enemy to Zuingle. The version of the Scriptures, made by Zuingle, was presented to Luther. He returned it with abuse, and uttered these remarkable words: "I will not read the works of these people who are *out of the church of God*, and are not only damned themselves, but drawing with them many miserable persons. While I live I will make *war* upon them by my PRAYERS and my *writings*." On another occasion he uttered these words: "Zuingle is dead and damned, wishing as a thief and a seditious person to constrain others by force of arms to follow him." Brentius, the friend and follower of Luther, whose controversial writings are contained in eight folio volumes, makes this striking declaration: "The doctrines of the Zuinglians are devilish, full of im-

piety, depravity, and calumny; the error of Zuingle upon the Eucharist has led to many others yet more sacrilegious; the Zuinglians will soon introduce into the church of God the heresy of the Nestorians; the different articles of our religion will disappear one after another, and in their places will be substituted the superstitions of the Pagans, the Talmudists, and the Mahometans." This, Sir, is the writer whom the English Bishop Jewel calls "the serious and wise old man." But above all, take the following opinion expressed by a full synod of the Lutheran church. "The Zuinglians write that we regard them as brethren; this is a fiction so foolish, so impertinent, that we cannot be sufficiently astonished at their impudence. *We do not even accord them a place in the church*, and are far from recognising as brothers, the men we see filled with the spirit of lying, and uttering blasphemies against the Son of Man." Is not this enough to convince you that neither Luther nor any of his early followers were *perfectly* satisfied with the religious sentiments of Zuingle and his disciples? If not, then I will furnish you with some evidence more decisive.

On the other hand, I will show you that Zuingle and his followers were not *perfectly* satisfied with Luther and his religious sentiments. Zuingle makes this remark concerning Luther. "It is not rare to see Luther contradict in one page what he said on another; and to see him in the midst of his followers, you would think him besieged by a phalanx of devils." One of the friends of Zuingle makes this declaration concerning Luther. "God, to chastise the pride and arrogance of Luther, which shows itself in all his writings, withdrew his spirit from him, abandoning him to a spirit of error and lying, which will always possess those who follow his opinions, until they renounce them." And above all, hear the opinion of the Zurich church concerning Luther. "Luther treats us as an execrable and damned sect, but let him take care that he does not prove himself an arch-heretic, for this reason, that he will not and cannot associate with those who confess Christ. But how this man suffers himself to be carried away by demons! His language is filthy and his words are full of the devils of hell! He says the devil dwells now and for ever in the bodies of Zuinglians; that blasphemies are exhaled from their very devilish, more than devilish, superlatively devilish bosoms; that their tongue is a lying tongue, moved at the will of Satan, and deeply saturated, more than saturated, superlatively saturated in his infernal venom. Saw you ever such discourse from a furious demon?" Are these extracts sufficient to convince you that neither Zuingle nor his friends were *perfectly* satisfied with either Luther or his doctrines? If not, then I will furnish you with evidence more decisive. I wait your answer. *Letters*, p. 103. *Review*, p. 17. *Luther's Works*, fol. vol. II. p. 36. *Brentius' Works*, fol. *In Recogn. Prophet. et Apost. In Bullingeri. Coron. etc. Ans. to Luther's Con.* fol. Book II. pp. 454, 381. *Conrad on the Lord's Supper*, Book II. *Church of Zurich against Confession of Luther*, p. 61.

2. *Calvin.* I made a quotation from one of Calvin's letters, in which his determination to destroy Servetus is clearly expressed. Your answer to this statement is contained in the following sentence. "Mr. Whitman quotes a letter from Calvin, without suggesting a doubt as to its authenticity; which is not printed among his other letters, and which it is improbable he ever wrote." You say this letter is not printed among the other letters of Calvin. No one ever said it was. You then infer that he never wrote such a letter. Your inference is without foundation. The facts are these. The letter was not printed, but preserved in Paris. "Mr. D'Artiguy affirms this. Bolsec and Grotius *saw* the original letter. Utenbogardt had a copy of it taken from a collection of manuscript epistles, and Calvin's admirers have not been able to deny it." Varillus and Sorbieve with others speak of the letter. And above all Sennébier, who wrote a book in defence of Calvin, quotes from the letter. If this is not enough to establish the authenticity of the letter, then I will furnish more convincing evidence. *Letters*, pp. 105, 106. *Review*, p. 20. *Wright's Servetus*, pp. 130, 131. *General Repository*, vol. IV. p. 48. *La Roche, Mem. of Lit.* vol. iv. pp. 50 – 51.

III. Pilgrims.

Only two of your remarks on my statements under this division deserve an answer. 1. I asserted that our Pilgrim fathers did not hedge up the entrance to the Lord's Supper with doctrinal creeds. In proof of my assertion, I gave the covenants adopted by three of the first New England churches. In answer to all this evidence, you ask one or two questions. And first, you wish to know if I "really believe our fathers were averse to a public confession of faith." Certainly. Besides the satisfactory reasons for this belief which I have already advanced, I will now give you an article from the laws of our fathers on this very subject. This is the important enactment. "*Sec.* 6. No injunction shall be put upon any church, church officer, or member in point of doctrine, worship, or discipline, whether for substance or circumstance besides the institution of the Lord." You also ask if I do not know that some of the early churches "were very strict in the admission of members." Certainly. I know there were narrow-minded men at that day as well as at the present; and that they violated their own fundamental principles, as well as the plain teachings of the Scriptures. I also know that great men among them bore faithful testimony against these unchristian usurpations. Take one specimen from the celebrated Cotton Mather. These are the words. "And let the table of the Lord have no rails about it, that shall hinder a godly Independent, and Presbyterian, and Episcopalian, and Antipædobaptist, and Lutheran, from sitting down together there. Churches that will keep up instruments of separation, which will keep out those that have the evident marks and claims of them that are one with Christ upon them, are in reality but combinations of men, who, under pretence

of religion, are pursuing some carnal interests. Their Diana is very visible. It is a complicated profanity and hypocrisy, that these churches are to stand indicted for. It is to be lamented, that more churches than one have the guilt of a very sinful schism to be charged upon them, for their chasing from their communion, and the annexed encouragements and emoluments, many of the righteous nation, which have the gates of heaven standing open for them; and yet such is the mystery of iniquity, that at the same time they make outcries of schism against the conscientious people, for keeping out, while they violently shut the doors upon them." Are your questions satisfactorily answered? Let me then ask you one. Did you know that a goodly portion of the people in those days were liberal on this subject of communion, and that they only waited to know their strength in order to rise against such bigoted priests as then endeavoured to rule? Let this question be answered by the same orthodox divine. "There are concurring with you, hundreds of thousands of generous minds, in which this apprehension lies now shut up as an *aurum fulminans*. But it will break forth more and more, as the day approaches, and as men improve in manly religion, in explosions that will carry all before it. And the mean, little, narrow souls, that know no religion but that of a party, and their secular interest, will become deserted objects, for the disdain and pity of them, who have taken the way that is above them." Is Cotton Mather among the prophets?

Of the same opinion was the pious and orthodox Richard Baxter. These are his precious words. "Two things have set the church on fire, and been the plagues of it above one thousand years. 1. Enlarging our creed, and making more fundamentals than ever God made. 2. Composing and so *imposing* our creeds and confessions in our own words and phrases. When men have learned more manners and humility than to accuse God's language as too general and obscure, as if they could mend it, and have more dread of God, and compassion on themselves, than to make those to be fundamentals or certainties which God never made so; and when they reduce their confessions, first, to their due extent, and second, to scripture phrase, that dissenters may not scruple subscribing, then, and I think, never till then, shall the church have peace about doctrinals. It seems to me no heinous Socinian motion which Chillingworth is blamed for, viz.; Let all men believe the Scripture, and that only, and endeavour to believe it in the true sense, and promise this, and require no more of others, and they shall find this not only a better, but the only means to suppress heresy, and secure unity. Shall men be judged Socinians for advancing the Scriptures as the only rule?"

2. I asserted that the third fundamental principle of the Pilgrims was, the "*perfect independence of every congregational church.*" Your answer to this statement is contained in the following sentence. "If

he means by this that our fathers considered every individual church as in all respects independent of the neighbouring churches, acknowledging no formal connexion with them, or responsibility to them; or if he means that our fathers considered and styled themselves *Independents*, he is greatly mistaken." Now you knew perfectly well the meaning of my proposition. You knew that I meant neither of your statements. Our fathers disclaimed the name of *Independents;* and this every one must know who ever read their writings. They acknowledged their connexion with sister churches, so far as to live on terms of union and fellowship. But they considered each church as perfectly independent. In proof of your assertion, you have made two quotations. One is from the apologists of the Westminster Assembly. Now in the name of common sense, what has the opinion of these men to do with the independency of the New England churches. You might as well have quoted from the proceedings of the Council of Trent. Did you bring forward this extract through ignorance, or to blind the eyes of the more ignorant of your own denomination?

Your other quotation, you ascribe to Increase Mather. You have given no reference to the place where it is to be found. I believe you have perverted his meaning; for I find no such sentiment in any of his writings; and I find the place from which your other quotation is taken. And in that very connexion, Increase Mather is disclaiming the name of *Independents*, and at the same time advocating the independency of congregational churches. I will give you a few sentences from this very place, which must put you to shame and confusion. "The principles of those, who are for the congregational discipline, are such as these. 3. That a particular church has power given to them from the Lord Christ, to choose their own officers, viz. pastors, teachers, ruling elders, and deacons. 5. That a particular church being furnished with elders, at least with a teaching elder, has *full* power to exercise discipline within itself, without depending on *any* other superior jurisdiction. The famous Mr. Paul Baine affirms particular churches are equal and *independent* on one another. It is very unreasonable, *that for this*, congregational men should be nicknamed *Independents*. A late author says, that in the primitive times every particular church was *independent*, that is, that it had a sufficient right and power in itself to punish all its delinquencies, without the concurrence of other churches. There is then no reason why such as are for the congregational discipline, should be reproachfully called *Independents*." All this was written by Increase Mather in his seventy-eighth year; and as you perceive, is designed as a defence of the independency of the congregational churches. But this is not all. I will give you another extract from his works, written when he was eighty-one years old. These are his words. "That the churches of New England have been originally of the congregational persuasion

and profession, is known to every one. Their Platform does expressly dislike and disclaim the name of *Independent.*" Why so? Hear the old man's reason. "The reason why that name has been imposed upon them was, because they maintained, that a particular and organized church has *entire power*, within itself, to manage the affairs of the kingdom of Christ, and the holy discipline belonging to it, without a *dependence* on *any* superior power on earth." Is not this enough to satisfy you that this divine defended the perfect independence of every congregational church? Thus have I said enough to defend my statement, and refute your pretended argument and authority. *Letters*, p. 134. *Review*, p. 21. *Disquisition on Ecclesiastical Councils*, pp. 6, 7. *Preface to Ratio Disciplinæ*, p. 1.

But since you have called in question the independency of the congregational churches, I will let the Pilgrim Fathers settle it to the entire satisfaction of every honest man. The Puritans originated in England; and what was their decision on this subject? Hear their own explanation. "1. They hold and maintain, that every congregation or assembly of men, ordinarily joining together in the true worship of God, is a true visible church of Christ. 3. That Christ has not subjected *any* church or congregation to *any other* superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction than to that which is *within* itself; so that if a whole church or congregation should err in any matters of *faith* or *worship*, *no other churches*, or spiritual officers, have power to *censure* or *punish* them, but are *only* to counsel and advise them." You also know that John Robinson was the father of the Pilgrim church at Plymouth. And what was his opinion on this subject. Hear the words of his biographer. "He maintained to the last, that every particular church or society of Christians had a complete power within itself, to choose its own officers, to administer all gospel ordinances, and to exercise all acts of authority and discipline over its members; and that consequently it was *independent* upon all classes, synods, convocations, and councils." You likewise know that the society in Salem was the first regularly organized congregational church in New England. When the first ministers were ordained, Governor Bradford from Plymouth church was to express the right-hand of fellowship. But he was not permitted to perform this friendly service until it had been distinctly proclaimed, "that no inference should ever be drawn from it, in support of the idea, that there was *the least dependence whatever in this church upon others, or the least necessary connexion between it and other churches, wherever they might be.*" You indeed assert, that these ministers had been ordained in England. Certainly. And had you not sufficient discernment to perceive, that this is the strongest possible argument for the independency of that church? They paid no regard whatever to the former ordination, but proceeded precisely as if no such service had ever been performed. You also intimate,

that the Plymouth delegation were prevented from taking a part in the other performances, because they did not arrive in due season. You know this is not correct; that no such meaning was intended by the writer, from whom you quoted the passage. But not to detain our readers any longer by your quibbles, I would ask you to look at the decisions of the first synod of New England. These are the words. "2. That *none* of our particular churches shall be subordinate to one another, each being endowed with equality of power from Jesus Christ. And that none of the said particular churches, their officer or officers, shall exercise *any* power, or have *any* superiority, over *any* other church or their officers." Hear also the decision of the third synod. "Every church or particular congregation has *full* power and authority ecclesiastical within itself, regularly to administer all the ordinances of Christ, *and is not under any other ecclesiastical jurisdiction whatever.*" Listen likewise to the following words of the Rev. Samuel Mather. "And, as these churches assert and claim the right of private judgment as men, as Christians, and as Protestants, they also declare for and maintain the rights of particular churches. For they conceive that *every Christian society or church* ought not to have *any dependence* in ecclesiastical matters, nor are obliged to acknowledge the authority of councils and synods for their direction and government, but ought to be governed *within* itself, and by its own laws. They acknowledge, indeed, that they ought to exercise their proper jurisdiction and government within themselves, with dependence upon our blessed Saviour, together with his Holy Spirit and unerring oracles. But they think themselves by *divine right* excused from subjection to *any* other church, though it be a mother one, and that they may exercise an *independent* jurisdiction *within* themselves." Listen, finally, to some extracts from the orthodox President Stiles. "We agree that every individual church has the *sole* power of judging and determining its own controversies. Our churches, to the purposes of discipline, are so many distinct, ecclesiastical sovereignties, in point of power and control, as independent of one another as the United Provinces of Holland to the purposes of civil government.—Our churches acknowledge *no* jurisdiction of sister churches over them; but hold themselves both capable and to have power to determine all matters of difference that arise in a particular church.—The constitution of our churches, like those in the apostolic age, is *independent*, *free*, and *social*; and our platforms were received by the body of the churches *only* as plans of union and mutual fellowship; explicit agreements, in which, referring to themselves individually their *independence*, *equality*, and *unaccountableness* to one another, they united in general communion, in ordinances, pastoral labors, advice, and councils." Are not these authorities sufficient to settle this question for ever? If you think not, say so, and I will furnish you with as

many more. Who understood the principles of the Pilgrims best, the Pilgrims themselves, or Enoch Pond? *Letters*, p. 134. *Review*, p. 31. *Neal's Puritans*, vol. II. p. 86. *Neal's New England*, vol. I. p. 73; vol. II. p. 660. *Upham's Second Century Lecture*. *S. Mather's Apology for the Churches*, p. 6. *Stiles's Convention Sermon*, pp. 34—56.]

IV. HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

You have contradicted but three of my positions under this section. Two of your assertions I shall not notice, because a complete and final refutation of the orthodox slanders against this ancient Institution is this day published. If those who have believed your misrepresentations of the College neglect to read this defence from a member of the Corporation, I cannot regard them as honest Christians. And if any individual can peruse this book without conviction and satisfaction, he is not to be envied for his reasoning powers. I call upon all the enemies of the College to study "Mr. Gray's Letter to Gov. Lincoln on Harvard University."

I asserted, on the authority of an orthodox church member, that there was more dissipation at Amherst College than at Cambridge. You affirm that this student was suspended, both from the church and College, and that I must have known these circumstances. Your insinuation is without foundation; for I knew nothing of these facts at the time of writing my Letters. Your very confession, however, serves to establish my position. For I cannot learn that this student ever drank to excess while at Cambridge, before his conversion. Now if the temptations are so great at Amherst, that an orthodox church member *must* be suspended for intoxication, is it not clearly demonstrated, that there is more dissipation at Amherst than at Cambridge? *Letters*, p. 144 .*Review*, p. 35.

V. CATHOLICS.

You have attacked two of my statements under this section. In one instance, your correspondent apologizes for his own conduct, but does not deny the truth of my positions; and the other assertion of yours I will now answer. In showing that some of the measures of the exclusionists were worse than those of the Catholics, I asked, whether an orthodox church had not lately excommunicated some of its members for attending another orthodox church;—and whether their proceedings had not been sanctioned by an Ecclesiastical Council, with the Rev. Mr. Storrs at its head;—and whether the aggrieved had not appealed to Professors Stuart and Woods. You make three misrepresentations out of my two first questions. I will therefore give you an outline of this most aggravated instance of clerical usurpation, oppression, and tyranny.

The circumstances are briefly these. Mr. A. Hathaway and wife, and Mr. B. Hathaway, belonged to the orthodox church in Berkley, of which the Rev. Mr. Andros is pastor. About two years since they

became dissatisfied, and joined the orthodox society in Taunton. They requested a dismission and recommendation, but for certain reasons waived their application to the church. In July, 1830, the church in Berkley convened an ecclesiastical council, consisting of four ministers and four delegates. The Rev. Mr. Cobb of Rochester was moderator, and the Rev. Mr. Storrs principal scribe. The three aggrieved members agreed to consider the Council as a mutual one, and accordingly submitted to their judgment the following question. "A. Hathaway and wife, and B. Hathaway, will take the advice of this Council in regard to their right to have letters of dismission and recommendation from this church to Mr. Maltby's." Zechariah Eddy, Esq., a distinguished orthodox lawyer from Middleborough, and brother to the aggrieved lady, was admitted as their counsel. Two petitions were addressed to the council by the aggrieved. They asked for dismission on the plea of *better edification*, as may be learnt from the following extract. "I earnestly hope you will advise that I be dismissed and recommended to the church in Taunton according to my request. I have claimed and do now claim the full benefit of the laws on religious freedom. I claimed the benefit of those laws by joining the religious society in Taunton. I cannot have the *full* benefit of them, unless I am also allowed to join the church there. I claim also the rights of conscience as protected by the usages of the churches. I am conscientious in my claim; I cannot conscientiously belong to the society here; I cannot be edified here; I get no religious improvement here; I seek better edification."

What was the result of Mr. Storrs? Was this reasonable request granted? No. And what were the reasons assigned? Such as none but tyrants would dare to advance. Listen to his own words. "You assign no reason for your dismission, except that you cannot be edified by the means here enjoyed; and when asked why you cannot be edified, you answer by setting up a claim to have your own feelings sanctioned as the proper rule of your conduct. And this you claim, not on gospel principles, but on those of civil and political freedom. You have also claimed the right of withholding your support from the church and pastor with whom you are in covenant on the ground of law. We interfere not with the law; we are not called to do it; but we do solemnly protest, brethren, against members of Christ's church claiming advantage of a civil right to violate a covenant obligation. It appears to us, that although by such procedure you violate no law of man, yet you would violate a law of Christ, to which you owe higher obligations of obedience; you violate the platform and usages of our churches, and the obligation which every Christain owes to the church of which he is a member. We are under law to Christ; we are bound to walk in covenant with our brethren; and for disannulling the obligations of this covenant, and for being loosed from that law, we ought to assign some better rea-

son, than the fact that we choose to be free." Such, Sir, is the reasoning of congregational ministers in this commonwealth, in this nineteenth century!

In the true spirit of this result, the church "voted, that two months be allowed to Barzillai Hathaway, Asahel Hathaway and his wife to *return* to the church, and if they do not in that time return, *they will be considered as disconnected from the church.*" Here then you have the vote of excommunication. They were *not* excommunicated, because two months were given for repentance; and within that period, circumstances occurred to prevent the execution of this unrighteous sentence. A petition was immediately presented to the pastor and church, signed by seven of its own members, besides another signed by the three aggrieved ones, to induce it to unite in calling another mutual council, "to consider and advise" on the same subject. These the pastor would not communicate. Letters from the same individuals were then sent to eleven churches, in order to convene an *ex parte* council. Among those invited were the Rev. Drs. Beecher and Codman. Only five of the eleven dared to attend, and these five not of the leaders. To this body, two most able petitions were presented, one from the church members who disapproved of the first result, and the other from the aggrieved members. From the former of these I will now present you with the following extracts. "Is it, or is it not, contrary to the true intent and meaning of the church covenant, and to the law of Christ; in other words, does it consist with true liberty of conscience, that the churches should give dismissions and recommendations under the circumstances which have been named? These are in substance, that the brother is in good standing, that he selects an orthodox church, seeking, as he says, and as we believe, 'better edification' therein, a church with which we are in fellowship, within a convenient distance for worship, watch, and discipline." — "Professor Stuart in his letter to Dr. Channing, says, 'You accuse us of wishing to use compulsion in matters of religion,' and *justly*, if we are about to say, 'You shall not worship in our sister church, though orthodox and in fellowship with us; we not only will not allow it, but if you do, we will send after you such punishments as are in our power to inflict.' If we say and do this, how much reason is there to fear, that if we cannot accomplish the object and fail with the terrors of excommunication; we shall soon covet powers more efficient and less spiritual!" — "Christian liberty is the very pivot on which the grand controversy seems to be poised. The enemy is called upon, is challenged to give an instance among the orthodox churches, in which they have desired to use compulsion in matters of religion. We pray God that our church may not be the one in which this instance shall be found." Such is a specimen of these orthodox petitions. Their ability cannot be seen without reading the whole in connexion. And what was the result of this second council? It may be

learnt from the following sentence. "Therefore our opinion is, that the said Barzillai Hathaway, Asahel Hathaway and wife, by acknowledging in writing sent in to the pastor of this church, that it was irregular for them voluntarily to absent themselves from the communion, be considered worthy of the fellowship of this or any orthodox church." Wonderfully liberal!

Upon the whole, Sir, this is the worst case of orthodox oppression which has come to my knowledge. For all the aggrieved were orthodox in sentiment, and of good Christain standing. The question was one of religious liberty. And a more daring attempt to deprive worthy individuals of their sacred rights cannot be found in the annals of congregationalism. I can assure you that I am not alone in this opinion. I have received a letter from Zech. Eddy Esq. on this very subject, in connexion with the documents of the case. I have no liberty for its publication. But as it contains the decided views of a distinguished orthodox layman on a most important topic, I shall give you a few extracts from it, hoping he will duly appreciate my motives, and pardon my liberty. Here are his words. "Sir, you perceive the enclosed proceedings regard the question of religious freedom, and the councils were both orthodox. I made no small noise about the first result, and sent my complaints far and wide among the orthodox clergy. *My complaint remains.* Although the second result is sufficient for my sister to get admitted into an orthodox church, yet my complaint is, that a large portion of the small clergy are stickling for the principles of the first result, and show a spirit unfriendly to true freedom;—that the question was *known to be pending* by, at least, all the *leaders* to whom the letters missive were sent, and that they forebore to attend the council and to settle the question *themselves*, so as to promote by *example* the true principles of religious liberty, leaving it to a *few country clergymen* to revise the doings of Mr. Storrs's council, *if they dared.* Now I want *practical evidence* that the orthodox clergy, *as a body*, do not approve of his result. They have all heard from me and know my views and feelings, and they know I am a man, who, as well as my friends and connexions, am determined to be heard. The conduct of several individuals of these *leaders* has not pleased me since the result of the second council; they are afraid or unwilling to come out, and they work also *secretly* to do away the effect of that result, saying, that it is of no weight, because a *mutual council* first decided otherwise; willing, as I think, to see ecclesiastical power dominate, although, not only particular Christians, but the church should be ruined. The advice of an orthodox council must be paramount to right; and, though wrong, stand, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable. Popery is no worse. Dr. Beecher and Dr. Codman and the rest knew me, and they knew the noise I was making. They did not come to the council. The question still stands—What are the principles of

the orthodox clergy on this subject? There is no question relating to religious freedom so important as this. It was on this very point that all the miseries of dissenters and nonjurors were experienced. Can we not leave a particular Christian church when we please, without drawing fire, temporal and spiritual, or both, after us? We ought to know. If we cannot, let us warn our children; a little unwariness here may prove their ruin. *I have been a coadjutor to this order of the clergy.* Consociationism is no better than Popery. Congregationalism allows all separate societies to chose their own teachers and to retain them, and for a legal cause to depose them; also to form churches and to disband them, as they please. Church order without Christian liberty is slavery, or rather ecclesiastical tyranny. Let this matter be probed to the bottom. I am willing people should be searched out in this matter, and their intolerance exposed." The *italics* are his own.

Such, Sir, is a specimen of the spirit which is somewhat prevalent among orthodox layman. Were I at liberty to communicate one half of my knowledge on this subject, I could state facts which would make your ears tingle. A friend of mine has been travelling in different parts of the commonwealth, and conversing with the independent yeomanry of our land, and could you know only a small part of what has been said by substantial orthodox Christians on this very subject, you would begin to tremble on your throne. The result of the whole is this. The leaders of the orthodox are suspected of evil designs. The exclusive system is reprobated. The assumptions and oppressions of the clergy are discovered. And the day of retribution is fast approaching. *Letters*, p. 147. *Review*, pp. 58, 59.

VII. Tracts.

Under this section, I endeavoured to expose the unrighteous and self-righteous principles upon which your leaders are acting in the distribution of religious tracts. In order to give a definite and particular statement of facts, I related some of the proceedings of the orthodox in East Sudbury. You have merely denied the truth of one or two unimportant assertions, and then advanced several weighty charges against the members of the unitarian society in that place. I will therefore notice your remarks and accusations.

1. Speaking of the state of society in East Sudbury, I made the following statement. "They all attend a unitarian meeting. One of your disorganizers enters the peaceful fold, and succeeds in turning some of the flock from their present pastor." Your "highly respectable correspondent" gives a counter statement, which I am now able to prove incorrect by the following testimonials of the Rev. Mr. Wight. These are his words. "The Reviewer would have given a more full and impartial account of the principal circumstances of the separation to which he has reference, if he had ascertained and stated the following facts respecting it. 1. The minister refer-

red to, while he could not enter into every measure which two or three of the brethren of the church, under the influence of a strong religious excitement, wished him to adopt, was willing and happy to encourage and assist them in all their good desires and endeavours, so far as he could do it consistently with his views of order and expediency. 2. In compliance with their wishes and with the unanimous consent of the church, he held meetings on the days of the monthly concert and also weekly, in which he afforded to those of them who desired it, full opportunity to give exhortations and to lead in prayer. 3. While he could not in opposition to the advice of all the other brethren of the church, and to the sentiments of the great body of the people, comply with their request that he should invite the members of the Suffolk Association to hold meetings in the town, he always expressed and manifested a willingness to exchange with any ministers whom they wished to hear; or if it was not convenient for any of them to exchange with him, to invite them to preach at his sacramental lecture. 4. The day before he received their request to be dismissed from the church, the principal of them invited him to a conference, in which he declared to him, that if he would consent not to exchange with any unitarian ministers out of the Association, and if he would invite the members of the Suffolk Association, who had *already* commenced their labors without his concurrence, to hold meetings in the town, they would remain, and that otherwise they must separate." Such, Sir, is the modest defence of this minister, whose character for veracity, honesty, prudence, and Christian holiness stands as high as that of any other divine in the country. And you perceive that his statements completely refute the assertions of your anonymous correspondent, who has been meddling in affairs with which he has no proper acquaintance. *Letters*, p. 156. *Review*, p. 36.

2. I also stated that the orthodox secession took from the annual salary from five to ten dollars. The truth of this statement you deny. I will give you the correct state of the case from the proper officers. "The first year after the orthodox society was formed, it was thought best that the minister of the first parish should consent that no estate remaining in the parish should be taxed higher according to its valuation than it was the year before the formation of that society. The deficiency in the salary this year amounted to twenty-four dollars and some cents. The second year the tax was laid on the same principle, and in consequence of property coming into the society, and of the increased valuation of the wood-land, the deficiency in the salary amounted to *ten dollars and twenty-two cents*. For the last year, the third since the formation of the orthodox society, the number of polls belonging to it was twenty-four, and the whole number of polls in the town two hundred and twenty." Thus you perceive the nature of my mistake. At the time of writing I was informed verbally that the de-

ficiency was "about ten dollars," and in this way, fell into the slight error which I cheerfully correct. I ought also to say for the credit of this people, that the deficiency was readily made up by individual subscriptions. *Letters*, p. 156. *Review*, p. 37.

3. You charge the unitarians with "beating drums, besmearing cushions, and throwing rotten eggs" at the orthodox ministers who went to aid the seceders. That some such things were done I do not deny. But by whom were they done? By the unitarians? — by professing disciples? Are such measures sanctioned by unitarianism? — or do they meet the approbation of unitarian Christians? You know better. Why then did you mention such actions? Suppose the infidel should denounce orthodoxy, because so many in orthodox societies are guilty of intemperance, quarrelling, profaneness, theft, falsehood, and debauchery. Would you regard such a statement as sound argument? Would you not affirm that orthodoxy did not sanction such doings, and that they were reprobated by orthodox Christians; and that whenever professing disciples were convicted of such crimes, they were disciplined? And should you not regard this as a sufficient refutation of such a calumny? How then could you condescend to make assertions which serve but to condemn yourselves? Not only so. Bringing such proceedings to the light must operate most forcibly against your denomination. For every body knows that those who engage in such transactions make no pretensions to piety. But, Sir, the evils charged upon the orthodox are perpetrated by your most prominent, most zealous, most sanctimonious church members, and ministers. And an attempt to justify their irregularities, by the mention of those low measures adopted by the irreligious, renders your proceedings more criminal, and your defence much more feeble. But this is not all. Under the garb of piety, you sow divisions, discords, revilings, and enmities in families, neighbourhoods, and societies. Are the evils you inflict any the less severe, because perpetrated under a holy name, and with a disfigured countenance? Are not these evils, in themselves considered, really greater than those of which you complain? I am not saying this to justify any species of iniquity. But, Sir, you should remember that the "world's people" are made of flesh and blood as well as orthodox ministers, and that their rights are equally dear and sacred; and that you may do them much greater injury under the name of religion, than they can do you under that of immorality. *Review*, p. 36.

4. Referring to one of the seceding deacons in this place, you make the following statements. "He" (Mr. Whitman) "may recollect the case of a physician in a neighbouring town, who was once a deacon of the unitarian church, and who, by his faithful attendance and skill, had secured the confidence and patronage of all around him; but no sooner did he become orthodox, and attend an orthodox meeting, than he began to be reproached and forsaken. His unitarian neighbours

immediately invited another physician to settle among them and take his place; and even his former minister, who for years had been favored with his services *gratuitously*, dismissed him at once, for the new comer, and advised his people to do the same." Your statement contains two charges, one against Mr. Wight, and the other against his society. I will notice them in this order.

In answer to your charge against the Rev. Mr. Wight, I am happy to present you with the following extract from his letter to me in relation to this subject. "With respect to what is said of the treatment of the physician by his former minister, you may say, that if the writer of the Review had inquired of the physician, *he* could have told him that his minister was not wanting in manifesting a suitable sense of his kindness and attention in his professional services, and that the conferring of *gratuitous* benefits was not altogether confined to *one* of the parties. If he had inquired of the minister himself, he might have learnt from *him*, that he had nothing to do in the introduction of another physician into the town, that no one could regret more than he the circumstances which rendered it unsuitable for him to continue to apply to a physician who had taken ground which was virtually in opposition to his church and society; and that the assertion, that he advised his people to dismiss the old physician and employ the new one, is entirely untrue; as, although he has ever had a high opinion of the skill and merit of the latter, he has been particularly careful to guard against all interference in this respect, and never has given such advice to any member of his society or to any other person." You thus perceive that your statement is proved altogether false from the highest authority. I would merely ask, whether your "highly respectable correspondent" has not dismissed his physician for a much less satisfactory reason than the unitarian minister could assign, and whether he also has not received much greater and more valuable *gratuitous* services.

In answer to your charge against the unitarian neighbours of the seceding physician, I present you the following letter from the most respectable individuals in the town. "In the Review of your Letters to Professor Stuart, we noticed the following paragraph" [the one already quoted.] "As the above paragraph is supposed to relate to transactions in this town, and as it seems intended to imply that the physician was abandoned and forsaken for no other reason than his embracing orthodox sentiments and attending orthodox meetings, we have thought it due to truth and our own character, as liberal Christians, to give a correct representation of the affair. For we consider that the character of many of the society is aspersed by the above statements. And as we have been informed that you are about to answer publicly the above Review, we will endeavour to go back to the origin of the case, and relate the principal causes which led some of

his former employers to lose their confidence in him as a physician, and their respect for him as a man. We hold ourselves responsible to substantiate by legal evidence any statements which we shall here make, if ever it may become necessary. Among other things which might be mentioned, we state the following :

"In the first place, while he was deacon of the church in this place, and before it was known that he had any intention of leaving it, and in all probability before he had any thoughts of it himself, reports derogatory to his character, calculated to bring reproach upon the church of which he was a prominent member, and to wound the cause of religion of which he was a professor, were in general circulation. The belief became more and more prevalent, that he had abandoned himself to intemperance, that he had been repeatedly found in a state of intoxication, and that he had had unlawful connexion with women of notorious bad character. As the evidence of the truth of these reports appeared to be daily accumulating, several of his brethren of the church thought it was high time he should be called upon to clear his character from such imputations; or in case he was not able to do it satisfactorily, to admonish him as an erring brother, and induce him to give satisfactory evidence of his reformation; or to excommunicate him as an incorrigible one, as circumstances might require. They accordingly called upon him, and endeavoured to convince him of the absolute necessity of either clearing himself of the charges, or of making such acknowledgments to the church as were indispensable to maintain its reputation for purity and faithfulness. They assured him that they entertained no other feelings towards him, than those of friendship, and urged the necessity of doing something to save the church from the foul reproach of giving countenance to such gross immorality. He did not pretend to deny the truth of the reports, but wished them to overlook his past conduct, and expect amendment in future. Very soon after this, he professed to have met with a sudden conversion, and to have changed his religious sentiments. Whether this profession ought to be regarded as sincere, or as an expedient adopted by him to bring his character again into repute, and to extricate himself from the difficulties in which his own conduct had involved him, is not for us to determine. It is sufficient for our purpose to state, that a strong suspicion that the latter was the case, had fastened itself upon the minds of many of those who afterwards dismissed him from their families and employed the young physician.

"In the next place, it appears that he formed the design to sell his place and practice and leave the town. Reports were in circulation that he had made a bargain to sell his place to a then neighbouring physician, one, of whom he had been in the habit of speaking in the most contemptuous terms before his employers; and one, against whom he very well knew they were strongly prejudiced, and in a great meas-

ure through his influence. Upon this, a meeting was called, and a committee of five chosen to ascertain whether he was about leaving town; and in case he was, to take measures for procuring such a physician as would be likely to give general satisfaction. He confessed to the committee that he had bargained with the aforesaid physician, so far as to give him the refusal of his place at a certain price, and that he had already offered within one hundred dollars of that price. He was told that in case he left town, the inhabitants would claim the privilege of choosing for themselves some physician to settle with them; and that they should object to his introducing any one without their consent. They told him that they did not come to overawe him, or interfere in any way with his religious belief, that they wished him not to name the subject, and that they desired only to know whether he had determined to leave them, in order, if that was the case, to take some measures to introduce, in his place, such an one as they would like. He replied, that he was aware the aforesaid physician was unpopular in town, and told them voluntarily, without being requested to do so, that he was determined not to leave town, nor Mr. Wight's society for the present, certainly not for one year. Notwithstanding this promise, he did in a very few weeks leave the society and join the orthodox.

"Shortly after this, his health was very much impaired, and he continued so unwell until the autumn following that he was generally considered unfit to discharge the duties of a physician. Toward the latter part of summer, he grew worse, and it was generally believed that he would never recover. A young physician having accidentally heard that he was unable to practise, and likely to live but a few days, came into town and made inquiries of the aforesaid committee in regard to the propriety of his settling among them. A meeting was called to consider the subject. Inquiries had been previously made of the medical gentleman who attended him in his sickness, as to the probability of his being able to practise again. His reply was, that in his opinion it was not probable he would recover, and that in case he did get better, his mind was so much debilitated, that it was not probable he would be fit to practise for a long time, if ever. Under these circumstances, it was thought both necessary and proper to encourage another physician to settle in the place. At the same time, another meeting was appointed to examine into the credentials of the candidate; and it was resolved to give him as exact information as possible in relation to the condition of the town, and leave him to act his own pleasure. After taking some time for consideration, he determined to establish himself in practice in this place, and has continued here to this time. These were some of the reasons which induced us to act as we did, and we have no objection to their being made known to the public, in order that it may judge of the propriety of our conduct."

Thus you perceive that your whole statement is legally proved false. I am sorry to publish such accounts, but you have compelled me. I have done nothing more than to defend my own positions, and refute yours. Now if you wish to investigate this affair more fully, I have no objection, and the people of East Sudbury manifest no reluctance. For if all the facts in the case could be presented to the public, the cause of orthodoxy would gain no advantage. You will also learn perhaps, that it is much easier to accuse me of making misstatements, than to give an accurate representation of the truth yourself. *Review*, pp. 41, 42.

Some of your observations, which could not be conveniently arranged under the preceding divisions, I will now notice.

1. *Anonymous Stories.* You find fault because I have withheld the names of persons and places in some of my statements. In answer to your complaint, I would make four remarks. In the first place, I withheld these names from the best of motives; because I did not wish to injure the feelings and standing of certain ministers; because I did not wish to fan the flame of discord in certain towns and societies, and because I did not wish to expose unnecessarily the witnesses from whom my statements were received. In the second place, I have uniformly manifested a willingness to give up all the concealed names to the proper authority. I even authorized one of my society to assure the orthodox minister of this place, who was busily collecting materials for your Review, that if he would call upon me, I would give him the name of every person and place alluded to in my Letters. The message was communicated, but no such application, either in person or in writing, was ever made. In the third place, you have found no difficulty in ascertaining who and what was meant, whenever one word could be said in answer to my statements. But in the fourth place, it is most astonishing that *you* should make this complaint; you, who have charged me with one hundred and fifteen misrepresentations and falsehoods; you, who have answered my logical conclusions with mere assertions; you, who have put together words enough to make a book of sixty or seventy pages; *you*, who have not *dared* to put your name to your own charges, assertions, and Review. Are you the man to complain of anonymous statements? Do you not know that many will not even look into your book, because it is without the name or names of its author or authors? I say *authors*, for if the question of our Saviour was put to the Editor of "The Sprit of the Pilgrims," in relation to the authorship of the Review — "What is thy name?" — you would be obliged to answer in the words of the demoniac — "My name is Legion, for we are many."

2. *Contradictions.* You have endeavoured to make your less informed readers believe, that I have contradicted myself in very many instances. By placing together parts of sentences, taken from their con-

nexion, by which their true meaning is determined, you have made out two or three pages of *apparent* inconsistencies. But I cannot regard you so simple as to think any intelligent person would consider them *real* contradictions. Take one example as a specimen of the whole. The following quotation is taken from your Review. "Sometimes the members of our new societies are represented as '*taxed to the full extent of their ability*'; and then they are 'promised an *exemption* from ministerial taxes,' and 'that nothing but their voluntary contributions will be required of them.' Now we have '*large funds* for the express purpose of establishing and maintaining such societies'; and then they must be supported by a system of the most '*pertinacious begging*.'" Now, Sir, you know perfectly well that each of these sentences contains the literal truth, and that there is no contradiction whatever between them. You know that some of the members of your feeble societies are taxed to the full extent of their ability, that they secretly complain of their enormous burthen, and that nothing but party spirit induces them to submit to such embarrassment. You also know that other members of your feeble societies have been repeatedly promised an exemption from all ministerial taxes; and that many more are required to pay no more than they choose. You likewise know that large funds have been expended for the erection of meeting-houses and the support of missionaries in unitarian parishes, which were collected by a system of the most pertinacious begging. Witness the efforts of Dr. Beecher when pleading for the "Home Missionary Society," before a Salem audience. Above all, witness the most shameful and disgraceful proceedings of your commissioned agent from Woburn. I did not make the assertions you have quoted without evidence; I can produce names whenever my statements are denied; you *dared* not deny their truth; for you knew that it was in my power to expose some most unprincipled proceedings of your leaders in this business.

Now, Sir, I have not referred to this mode of attack, because I fear its effect on my Letters. No; I have a higher object in view. By such a course you are aiding the cause of infidelity most essentially. Yes. Suppose the infidel should address you in this language: "Rev. Enoch Pond; you have run your eye over Whitman's Letters on Religious Liberty; you have selected more than two pages of apparent contradictions; you consider this collection sufficient to destroy all confidence in his statements; you proclaim this belief to the world, and you expect your ignorant readers to confide in your judgment. Now, Sir, I have turned over the leaves of the Bible; I have collected more than fifty pages of contradictions; the instances I have taken are much clearer and more striking than any you have exhibited; on your own mode of reasoning, no confidence is to be placed in any of the other statements; this my belief must be published for the benefit of the ignorant, and in my address to them, I shall merely adopt your language

in reference to Whitman's Letters, which is as follows: 'We have here thrown together some of the manifest inconsistencies and contradictions which have occurred to us on a cursory perusal of the Scriptures. Our readers will decide, in view of them, how much confidence is to be placed in writers, who thus cross their own track, in all possible directions, and without seeming to know it, just as their convenience or inclination may require.'" I say, suppose an infidel were to address you in this strain, as this is one of their most favorite weapons, how could you consistently return an answer? You could not. For if your mode of reasoning is conclusive against my statements, the same mode must be equally so against the Bible; not that I would intimate that my Letters are, like the Bible, wholly free from contradictions; but you have taken parts of sentences from their connexion, and thus made some *apparent* inconsistences. With how much more plausibility and force can the same thing be done with the Scriptures? If you have the least regard for the truth of Christianity, I do beseech you to refrain from thus aiding the cause of infidelity.

3. *Abuse.* You have dealt very largely in low and vulgar abuse. You have endeavoured, by your insinuations, innuendoes, sneers, sarcasms, and reckless assertions, to ruin my character for veracity, honesty, information, humanity, virtue, and piety. This is the opinion of the candid men of your own party. I do not think that you will obtain the thanks even of Professor Stuart for your present labors. It is scarcely a year since he averred, that your Journal should receive no encouragement from Andover, unless its spirit was essentially altered; and I think he will be as much dissatisfied with the mode of reasoning as with the spirit manifested in the present Review. But, Sir, all this abuse I expected. Before my Letters were published, I described the very mode of warfare which has since been pursued by your leaders. I counted the cost of my undertaking. I knew enough of the temper and character of some of your partisans, to anticipate an abundant shower of reproach, obloquy, low ridicule, contemptuous sneers, vile insinuations, gross scurrility, and downright slander. But none of these things moved me in prospect. I was not to be deterred by the fear of man from doing what I believed to be right and duty. And now, I am only sorry, that you should have disgraced yourselves so much in the estimation of all honorable men, given so much evidence of guilt and unchristian feelings, and done so much to injure the cause of our common Christianity. You certainly would not have dealt so largely in this cheap article of party warfare, had you felt perfectly innocent of the charges preferred, and possessed sufficient evidence and argument to prove them unfounded. I shall not return railing for railing; for my cause requires no such measures. I heartily forgive you this evil, and earnestly hope you may reform your feelings and conduct.

4. *Unitarians.* In some instances, you have charged the unitarians with pursuing the same measures which I have condemned in the orthodox. But what has this to do with the defence of orthodox proceedings? Suppose you could prove unitarians to be, what your creed pronounces them to be, totally depraved, wholly averse to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil; would this be any excuse for your iniquity? Not only so. There is this entire difference between the two cases. Unitarians do not act as a party; they are bound together by no system of sectarianism; every individual is perfectly independent. I take the Bible for my standard of faith and practice. I acknowledge no master but Jesus Christ. I go to no human being for my interpretations of of his instructions. I am responsible for my own opinions, and my own actions; and I shall defend the opinions and actions of no unitarian any further than I believe them to be true and Christian. The same may be said of every individual in the denomination. If, then, you have any fault to find with unitarian sentiments or measures, name the individuals you think erroneous and guilty. Each one will defend himself, or acknowledge his faults. Do not again be so unjust as to condemn the denomination for the supposed acts of individuals; for I wish I could make you understand what is meant by individual responsibleness, and freedom from party shackles. But this is not all. If you call upon unitarians to defend themselves, you will find their defence very satisfactory. You have mentioned the people of Raynham, as separating from the orthodox. I have given you the reasons of their conduct. Will not all honest men pronounce them sufficient? In almost every place you have mentioned, the reasons are almost equally satisfactory. You have alluded to Framingham. I should rejoice to give you a full statement of facts in this case. It would make you blush for the conduct of your leaders. But I am prevented by one circumstance only; and when this is removed, you may expect an exposure of orthodox management. So I might say of every place you have named. Let the facts in these several instances be given to the public, and the measures of unitarians will receive the approbation of all candid Christians.

5. "*Recorder.*" Perhaps you will ask me, if the Editor of the "Recorder" has not pronounced your Review able, thorough, and satisfactory; if he has not expressly said, that "the whole subject is thoroughly discussed in the Review, and the Letters are proved to be made up of misstatements, misrepresentations, and distortions of the truth; and in addition to this, of direct and positive falsehoods, even more than he had expected to see?" Such indeed are the words of our "cleanly neighbour," and when *we* read them, *we* could not help recollecting the following passage in his favorite Baxter. "Even among many accounted orthodox, pride and selfishness causeth them so far to overvalue their own judgments, as to expect that all should

be conformable to them, and bow to their arguments which have no strength, if not to their sayings and wills without their arguments; and to disdain, and passionately censure and reproach all that dissent and gainsay them." Should he read this evangelical extract "with pleasure and satisfaction" and improvement, perhaps he might be led to examine the evidence I have here presented, and to arrive at an opposite conclusion; even that the "whole subject is thoroughly discussed in the Letters to the Reviewer, and the Review proved to be made up of misstatements, misrepresentations, and distortions of the truth; and in addition to this, of direct and positive falsehoods, even more than he had expected to see." But we should not be too severe upon our "cleanly" Editor. For he is a mere youth, of a somewhat nervous temperament, possessing very respectable talents, and considerable acquaintance with biblical literature, and a great love for the writings of Richard Baxter. And we should not blame him altogether for the character of his paper. For before he commenced his editorial labors, he was much given to boasting of the improvement which would soon appear in its pages; and though with our "patent microscope, by which things invisible are plainly seen," we have been unable to discover this improvement; yet we remember that he is hampered, and fettered, and shackled by his employers; and that his contributors are not always willing to father their own deformed offspring. For his attention to my writings I would give him my thanks. In the mean time, I would direct his attention to the following extract from his favorite Baxter. "It is a dangerous case, especially to young, inexperienced Christians, to fall among those that make it their religion to vilify others as enemies to Christ. When they hear one sect only extolled, and all others spoken of as ignorant, carnal enemies to the church, it is two to one, but this imprinteth a schismatical disposition in the hearers' minds. Conversing only with one party doth usually occasion great uncharitableness towards all others, and sear the conscience, so that it grows insensible of revilings, and opprobrious speeches, against those that differ from them."

Conclusion. In the conclusion of your Review, after all your blustering and abuse, you seem to sue hard for peace. These are your words. "It is for intelligent and candid unitarians to decide, whether they will sanction this new mode of controversy; or so much as tolerate it. Are they willing this community should be thrown into a ferment, like that of a boiling caldron, by such a contest?" Your satellite, the Editor of the "Recorder," speaks the following language. "We now desire to ask, whether honorable men, of any party, are prepared to have religious controversy take this turn? Are they willing to have our community kept in a constant flame of discord and ill feeeling?" Now really, gentleman, you have